

T H R E E

DISCOURSES:

- I. Concerning *Transubstantiation*.
- II. Concerning *Invocation of Angels and Saints*.
- III. Concerning *The Worship of Images*.

With an Appendix concerning the Pretended Sacraments of
PENNANCE and *EXTREME UNCTION*.

Wherein the **CONTROVERSY** is fairly Stated, and the Arguments on both sides with all Plainness and Perspicuity offer'd to the View and Judgment of the *Impartial Reader*.

Compos'd chiefly for the Instruction and Conviction of those of the Romish Church.

By a Native of this Kingdom, and an Inhabitant of the
Queen's-County.

To which is Prefix'd

A Letter concerning the Pretended Infallibility of the Romish Church.

By another Hand.

Prove all things, hold fast that which is good, 1 Thess. v. 21.

D U B L I N :

Printed for the Author, by J. P. at the Sign of the Crown in Fishamble Street,
MDCCCVII.



THREE
DISCOURSES.

- I. Concerning *Transubstantiation.*
 - II. Concerning *Invocation of Angels
and Saints.*
 - III. Concerning *The Worship of
Images.*
-

THE
DISCOURSES

- I. Concerning Transubstantiation.
 - II. Concerning the Eucharist and Saints.
 - III. Concerning the Worship of Images.
-

A Letter to the Author
Concerning
The Pretended Infallibility of the Roman Church.
By a Friend

A Letter to the Author

Concerning

The present state of the Town Church

By a Friend

To the Roman Catholick Nobility,
Gentry, and Clergy of the Kingdom of
IRELAND; and more Especially
those of the *Queen's-County*.

Men; Brethren, and Fathers !

THe Sense of the many Temporal Inconveniencies you lye under by your Refusing to Renounce the Romish Doctrines of Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, and Image-Worship, has prompted me (out of the Tender Affection I bear to you my Country-Men and Kinsmen, for whom I can truly say with the Apostle Paul, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow of Heart IX Rom. 2.) to Inform my Self of what has been wrote on these Subjects by the Most Learned Authors both of the Romish and the Reformed Faith. Their Chief Arguments on either side I have brought into as Narrow a Compass as I cou'd, and with all Plainness and Impartiality Represented 'em to your View, to Enable you to Form a Clear Judgment on which side the Truth lies.

St. Peter tells ye, That if ye suffer for Righteousness sake, Happy are ye. But another Apostle also tells ye, That a Man may have a Zeal for God, but not according to Knowledge.

While the Sun-shine of Prosperity countenances Men's Opinions, There are but few that Examine whether they are in the Right or Wrong. The most Convincing Demonstrations seldom prevail against Errors that are supported by a Powerful Secular Interest. And I need not tell you how strong a Temptation of this Kind the Roman Bishop and Clergy have, wherever their Religion is Predominant.

But this is not your Case, who are no longer at present under the Byass of Temporal Interest. And therefore I may Reasonably Hope that your Minds will be more open to Conviction.

When I consider the Methods of Divine Providence towards the Irish Nation, the Natives whereof are now Reduc'd to so low an Ebb in their Fortunes, I cannot but think that they call you to Consider, Whether the Sin of
Idolatry

The Dedication.

Idolatry have not Provok'd that God who Declares Himself to be a Jealous God in the Matters wherein his Honour and Worship is Concern'd, to the Infliction of these Severe Judgments upon you? And whether the Adoration of the Consecrated Host, Praying to Angels and Saints, and Bowing down to Images, do not justly fall under that Heavy Charge of Idolatry, I must leave to your serious Thoughts upon the Perusal of these Discourses.

I Beseech you, my Brethren, to abandon that Vile Slavery of Implicit Faith. For once Imitate the Practice of the Noble Bereans, and compare the Doctrine of the Romish and the Reformed Churches with the Holy Scriptures, the undoubted Test and Standard of the Christian Religion.

I am sure those of you that know my Great Age, my Conversation, my Extensive Charity and Liberality to those of your Communion, can never suspect me to have any Worldly Interest of my own to promote by the Publication of these Discourses. Besides the Pains I have taken in Composing 'em. The Charge of Printing 'em, and Distributing 'em among you, may convince you that I can have no other end in my Eye than to bring you to the Acknowledgment of Divine Truth. And as I can Appeal to the Heart-Searching God for the Sincerity of my Intentions herein, so I can with the more Confidence commend these my Poor Labours to his Blessing.

And if these Plain Discourses may prove Effectual to the Turning any of you from the Error of your Way, I shall think my Pains and Cost happily compensated.

And lest your Preconceived Opinion of the Infallibility of the Roman Church shou'd Prejudice you against all Means of Conviction, I have Premis'd a Letter from a Friend on that Subject, which I hope will remove that Grand Obstacle out of your way.

But whatever Censure you may pass on these Discourses, I hope you will do that Justice to the Author, as to believe that he has no other than a Charitable Design in Publishing 'em, and that he is with all Sincerity,

Your

Affectionate Country-Man,

and Servant in our

Common Lord:



J. M.

REVEREND SIR,

I Have perused with much pleasure your plain and solid Discourses concerning *Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, and Worshiping of Images*. I am satisfied, that they carry sufficient Light and Evidence for the Conviction of all those of the *Romish* Persuasion, that read 'em with an unprejudic'd Mind. But 'tis easy to foresee, That this cannot be expected from 'em, while they are prepossess'd with a strong but groundless conceit, *That God has set up in his Church a Living and Infallible Judge of Controversies here on Earth; and that the Romish Church is that Catholick Church in which this supreme unerring Tribunal is erected.* It seems therefore highly necessary in order to the disposing 'em for an impartial consideration of the Arguments that are offer'd against these particular Doctrines of their Church, which you have undertaken to refute, to overturn this vain Pretension to *Infallibility*, that so visibly tends to harden 'em in their grossest Errors against all Attempts for their Conviction. For in vain do we endeavour to expose the *particular Errors* of the *Romish* Church to the view of her Profelytes, while they blindly submit their Judgments to her's from a confident Persuasion, *That 'tis impossible for her to Err at all.* I shall therefore endeavour to remove this grand Obstacle of their Conversion out of the Way, by shewing (as briefly as I can) the *Unreasonableness and Absurdity*, and the *mischievous and pernicious Consequences* of the Claim which that Church has so long set up, of *being Infallible in all her Decisions in Matters of Divine Faith*. And to that end, I shall endeavour to shew

I. That there is no Ground from the Holy Scriptures, to suppose, *That God has erected such a Living infallible Judge of Controversies in Matters of Divine Faith here on Earth; to whose Decisions all Christians owe an absolute Submission.*

II. That the *Asserting such an Infallible Tribunal, and Judge on Earth in Controversies of Religion, is a false and pernicious Principle, that subverts the very Foundation of the Christian Religion.*

III. *That the Asserters of this Infallible Tribunal entertain such Contradictory Opinions concerning it, as render this Principle as insignificant and useless, as 'tis false and pernicious.*

IV. *That on Supposition, there were such an Infallible Tribunal, The Church of Rome has of all others the least pretension to engross this Priviledge of Infallibility to themselves.*

V. *That the Church of Rome's having made use of this Pretension to justify all the Crueltys she exercises against those that Dissent from her Decisions, has thereby furnished us with a new and demonstrative Argument against the Infallibility she so confidently pretends unto.*

And if these *Assertions* be made good, it may be reasonably hop'd, that those of the *Romish Persuasion* may be more easily brought to think, That that Church has run into many other *particular Errors*, when she has run into so notorious a *One* as this, of laying a false and groundless Claim to so vast a Priviledge, as that of an *Exemption from all possibility of Erring at all.*

I shall therefore briefly Treat of the several Heads I have lay'd down in their Order; And

I. I shall shew, *That we have no ground from the Holy Scriptures to suppose, That God has constituted such a Living infallible Judge of Controversies in Matters of Divine Faith here on Earth, to whose Decision all Christians owe an absolute Submission.*

Had any such *Living Judge* been Constituted by God in his Church on Earth (whether a *single Person* or any *Assembly of Men*) for deciding all Matters of *Divine Faith*; Were the *Decisions* of such a *Judge infallible*, and to be receiv'd with an implicit Faith, and were there to be a *perpetual Succession* of such as shou'd be vested with this high Authority, and endued with this glorious Priviledge of Infallibility, We have all possible reason to expect, That those Holy Scriptures (which were written on purpose to *make us wise to Salvation*) shou'd clearly inform us, *Who this infallible Judge is*; that all true Christians might know whose Judgment they are to consult, and whose Decisions they are to receive and stand to in all controverted Articles of Religion. This is a Matter of so vast Consequence, and absolute Necessity for the Direction of all Christians, and for the prevention and cure of all pernicious Errors, that if there be such a *perpetual Living Oracle* in the Church, We may justly look for the plainest



est Declarations concerning it in those Inspired Writings. And therefore if we find, that the Holy Scriptures make no mention of such an *Unerring Judge*, give no Direction at all for continuing a *Succession* of such from Age to Age, lay down no Characters by which we may know and distinguish such an *Unerring Judge* from *false Pretenders*, nor give us any Charge to hear or receive his Decisions, their bare Silence in a matter of so unspeakable Moment as this, is instead of a thousand Arguments, That there is no such Divine Constitution at all.

I know indeed their Controversial Writers are wont to amuse their ignorant Profelytes, by alledging some Arguments for this *Infallible Tribunal* from the Holy Scriptures. But the truth is, Their Arguments from thence are so *frivolous* and *weak*, that we can hardly think they are *sincere* in proposing 'em. And a brief Consideration of 'em will be sufficient to shew, That they can never bear the weight of so vast Pretensions as these.

Among the Passages of Holy Scripture which they alledge, We may justly place in the first Rank the remarkable words of our *Blessed Saviour* to the Apostle *Peter*, *XVI. Matth. 18, 19 v. I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven.*

Now to shew, How little Countenance this famous Passage gives to the Pretensions of the *Romish Church* to *Infallibility*, I wou'd only Enquire, *Whose Infallibility* they wou'd pretend to prove from this Place? Is it the *Pope's*, or a *General Council's*, or both, or the *Infallibility* of the *diffusive Body* of those whom they call (tho' by a notorious contradiction in the very terms) *Roman Catholicks*?

I know indeed, The great Zealots for the *Papal Infallibility* draw their Capital Proofs for it from this Place. But they have these several things to prove.

1. *That our Blessed Saviour by these Words, constituted St. Peter alone the infallible Judge of Controversies to the Christian Church.*

2. *That St. Peter is to have a Successor in this Priviledge in every Age?*

3. *That this Successor is the Bishop of Rome.*

But how untowardly they go about the proving these Particulars, will appear in what follows.

1. They must prove, *That our Blessed Saviour by these Words, constituted St. Peter alone the Infallible Judge of Controversies in all Matters of Divine Faith.*

But that no such thing can be prov'd from these Words, will fully appear, if we consider the two following Particulars.

1. Those of the *Romish Church* declare themselves oblig'd to Expound the Holy Scriptures according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers. But now the Fathers generally Expound these Words not of *St. Peter's Person*, but of the Confession that he then made, *That Jesus was Christ the Son of the Living God.* This fundamental Truth, the Fathers suppose to be the *Rock on which the Church is built*, and against which the *Gates of Hell shou'd never prevail.* Now this signifies nothing to prove, That *St. Peter* is hereby constituted the infallible Judge of all Matters of Divine Faith. So that by their own Rule of Interpretation, this Text makes nothing for their purpose.

2. Tho' we shou'd suppose, that our *Blessed Saviour* here speaks of *St. Peter's Person*, yet 'tis evident, That he is not hereby Constituted the sole infallible Judge in Matters of Divine Faith.

For there is no *Authority* here ascrib'd to *St. Peter*, but what is elsewhere ascrib'd to the rest of the *Apostles*. If our *Saviour* here call *St. Peter the Rock on which he will build his Church*, on the account of this excellent Confession of his Faith? So all the *Apostles* and *Prophets*, are said elsewhere to be the *Foundation on which the Church is built, Christ himself being the chief corner Stone.* II. Eph. 20. The same *Power of Loosing and Binding*, which he here gives to *St. Peter* he elsewhere gives to the rest of the *Apostles*, XVIII. Matth. 18 v. If he here gives *St. Peter the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, so does he elsewhere give it to all his *Apostles*, when he constitutes 'em *Stewards in his House.* Nay, tho' we shou'd suppose (as some learned Expositors do) that this Expression imports the peculiar Priviledge that *St. Peter* shou'd have of first Preaching the Gospel both to *Jews and Gentiles*, This signifies nothing to prove his-being constituted the supreme infallible Judge of all Controversies in Religion. Had the Disciples

Disciples understood these Words concerning such a transcendent Privilege conferr'd on *St. Peter*, How came they afterwards to raise any such Dispute among 'em, *Who shou'd be greatest*? Nay, How comes our Saviour to retract this Privilege by forbidding any such *Dominion among 'em*? * How comes it that no such Marks of *St. Peter's* peculiar Privilege (as sole Infallible Judge of Controversies) appear in that Council of the *Apostles* and *Elders*, and *Brethren* at *Jerusalem* (which some so vainly pretend to be the Model of what they call *General Councils*)? Why does *St. Peter* himself challenge no such Privilege in his Epistles? Nay, Why does he disclaim any such *Lordship over God's Heritage*? 1 Pet. v. 3. Why do none of the rest of the *Apostles* take any notice of it, nor once urge their Converts to a submission to *St. Peter's* Infallible Judgment, and that in order to the silencing of all Disputes among 'em? Nay, Why does *St. Paul* so far forget his Duty, as to *withstand and rebuke* this pretended *Prince of the Apostles to his Face*, without paying any due Deference to his *superior Character and unerring Judgment*. II Gal. 11.?

* XX Matth.

25.

But farther to make good this Argument.

2. They must farther prove, *That St. Peter is to have a Successor in this Power of Judging all Controversies, and in this Privilege of Infallibility in every succeeding Age.*

But how to prove this, they are at an utter loss. For our Saviour here saith nothing of any such Matter. *St. Peter's Doctrine* as well as *that of the other Apostles*, may remain the *stable Foundation and impregnable Rock on which the Church is built to the end of the World*, tho' that *Apostle* have no *Successors* in his *pretended Infallibility* in every Age. Because those Sacred Records wherein *his* and *their Doctrine* is contain'd, have been, and shall be, preserved in the Christian Church to the end of the World. Nay, since no *Authority* is here ascrib'd to *St. Peter* but what is elsewhere ascrib'd to the rest of the *Apostles*, if we suppose *him* to have continual *Successors* therein, there is the same Reason to make the same Supposition concerning the rest of the *Apostles*; And so we must instead of *One* conclude, *That there are Twelve Infallible Judges* in matters of Faith in every Age. But where shall we find 'em? How comes *St. Peter* alone to delegate an Authority to *his Successor* which was not peculiar to himself, but common with him to the rest of the *Apostles*?

Why

Why were they so grossly negligent of the Church's Interest as to leave none *in their place*, who shou'd have the same Power of *binding* and *loosing* as they had, and who shou'd be the *Foundation on which the Church is built* in every successive Generation? Nay, How comes *St. Peter* never once to mention any *Successor* to whom he *bequeath'd* his vast Power and Privilege? How come the rest of the *Apostles* to be so entirely silent concerning theirs? Or if *St. Peter* alone had the Privilege of appointing a Successor, Why do none of the Apostles tell us *who he was*? Why does not *St. John* do it, who wrote after *St. Peter's* Death, and who cou'd not be ignorant of a Matter of so great consequence, and who cou'd not but know that it was a Matter of the highest moment to leave upon Record if it had been true? Why does he never once direct the *Churches of Asia* to quash the Heresies growing among 'em, by having recourse to *St. Peter's* Successor as the *Living Oracle*, whom the Church in every Age was bound to consult? There is therefore not only *no Proof* of *St. Peter's* Constituting any Successor in his pretended infallible judicial Power, but all imaginable *strong presumptions* against it.

But this is not all; For the Defenders of the Papal Infallibility

3. Must farther prove, *That the Bishop of Rome is the Successor to whom St. Peter has actually delegated his infallible judicial Authority.*

And how shall this be prov'd, when neither this Passage, nor any other in all the New Testament so much as once mentions the *Bishop of Rome*? Why *he* any more than the *Bishop of Jerusalem*, of *Cesarea*, of *Antioch*? For in all these Places the Apostle *Peter* did undoubtedly Preach the Gospel of Christ. How comes then the *Bishop of Rome* to arrogate this singular Privilege to himself of being *St. Peter's* sole Successor in all his glorious Powers and Pre-eminence? The Sum of what they have to say to such puzzling Questions as these, is no more than this. That there is a very *uncertain* and *doubtful* Story (For that is the best that can be made of it, For I might more justly call it a most *improbable one*) *That St. Peter dy'd a Martyr at Rome.* And therefore, all his *Authority* and *Infallibility* is to the end of the World entail'd on, and will descend to every one that does but get and keep possession of what they call the *Episcopal See* or *Chair* there,

there, even tho' they be the vilest Monsters of wickedness that ever breath'd on the face of the Earth. (For such many of his pretended Successors have been by the Confession of their most *partial Historians*, to whom they must yet suppose his Authority delegated, or else the *Line of Succession* is utterly *extinct* and gone). And can any Man that is not given up to *strong Delusions*, think this Argument of any force to support so *vast pretensions* as these? Was there ever so *mighty a Superstructure* rais'd upon such a *Quicksand* rather than a *Foundation*? But to compleat the *Jest*, (For an Argument I cannot call it) *St. Peter* must first be *degraded* from the *Dignity* of an *Apostle*, and by *dying at Rome* become the *Bishop* of that *particular Church*; And then the *Bishop* of that Church is by this lucky Accident to be *advanc'd* from being the *Bishop* of that *particular Church*, to be the *Head* and *Judge* of the *Universal Church*. An Argument altogether as ridiculous, As if because the *Primate of Ireland* shou'd happen to *dye* in some *particular Parish*, the *Parson* of that *Parish* shou'd from thence-forward pretend that the *Metropolitan Power* is for ever *entail'd* on him and all his *Successors* in that *Parish*. And yet such a senseless absurd Pretension as this is all the *Foundation*, That the *Papal Infallibility* and *Supremacy* as *St. Peter's Successor* stands upon.

I shall only add *one Argument* more, and that is an *Argument ad Hominem* that shou'd for ever silence all Pretensions from this Text to *Papal Infallibility*; and that is, that if the *Pope* be in this Text constituted by Christ *St. Peter's Successor* and the *Infallible Judge of Controversies*, then his *Infallibility* is a *Fundamental Article* of the Christian Faith, and all those must be guilty of *Heresy* that believe it not. And what then will become of the *Gallican Church*, (not to mention many more in the *Roman Communion* that are of the same mind) who do not believe the *Papal Infallibility* at all? For they assert the *Superiority of a Council above the Pope*. And if this Privilege of *Infallibility* belong to the Church at all, It must belong to *those* in whom the *supreme Authority* in the Church is lodg'd. To what purpose then do they offer an Argument to convince *us*, the force whereof is not acknowledg'd among themselves? Or how can we be *Hereticks* for denying what others disown as well as we who pass for *good Catholicks* among themselves?

And

And sure if this Text prove not *the Pope's Infallibility*, it can much less prove that of a *General Council*, when there is not one *Syllable* in it that has any sound that way.

But a late Popish Writer (suppos'd to be *Father Nery*) challenges us to *shew him any Text in Scripture more plain and Evident to prove any thing else, then this does the Infallibility of the Church*. To which purpose he thus Argues.

* See Modest and true Account of the Chief Points, &c. p. 41.

* " If the Gates or Power of Hell (for they are both the same) shall not prevail against the Church, surely then it shall not fall into Error. For there are but two ways of prevailing against it, *viz.* By destroying all the Members that compose it, as to their Temporal Being, or by corrupting their Souls with Error. That the Gates of Hell have not prevail'd as to the former, Our own Being is a sufficient Evidence. And that they shall not as to the latter, methinks a sober Man ought to be content with the assurance of Christ's Promise.

Ans. I need do no more to expose the Weakness of this Argument than to make the following Remarks upon it.

1. Whereas he tells us, *There are but two Ways by which the Gates of Hell may prevail against the Church, viz.* Either by *destroying all the Members that compose it as to their Temporal Being, or by corrupting their Souls with Error*, I can easily shew him a *third Way*, and that is by *corrupting their Souls with Vice and Wickedness*. And therefore if there be any force in his Argument, This *Promise* of Christ is as great a *Security* to the Church against the prevailing of *Damnable Wickedness* as of *Damnable Error*. And to secure the Church from the *One* is as Necessary as to secure it from the *other*.

2. I would desire the Author to tell us, What he understands by that *Church* to which this *Promise* of Christ is made.

If he understand either a *Pope* or a *General Council*, He must bring us some other Proof, That the *Church* in the Language of *Christ* or his *Apostles* is to be understood in this sense. The *Church* cannot here be understood of *the Pope*, because 'tis distinguish'd from *St. Peter*, whose *Successor* the *Pope* pretends to be. It cannot be understood of a *General Council*, For there was no such *Church* then in Being, nor for some Ages after; Nay (as I shall shew afterwards) There never was any such thing at all.

If he understand by the *Church* the *Diffusive Body* of such as are the *Disciples* of our Blessed Saviour thro' the World. I wou'd again Enquire, Does he mean, All those that are the *sincere Disciples of Christ*, and consequently the true Members of his Mystical Body, (which we call the *Church Invisible*) Or all that make an *External Profession of the Christian Faith* (which we call the *Visible Church*).

If he mean the *former*, I must farther Enquire, Whether he supposes, That our Saviour by this Promise secures all his *sincere Disciples* from all *Errors* in Doctrine whatsoever, Or only from all *Fundamental and Damnable Errors*? If from all *Errors whatsoever*, 'tis Notorious, that if this be the Meaning of the Promise, it never was fulfilled. All true Christians are no more secur'd from *lesser Errors* in Judgment then from *sinful Imperfections* in Practice. If he mean the *latter*, that they are only secur'd from all *damnable Errors*, what signifies this to prove their *absolute Infallibility in all Matters of Divine Faith*, or the *Obligation* that we are under to pay an *absolute and blind submission* to their Judgment in all their *Determinations*? And after all, since the *Church* in this sense is *Invisible*, since no Man can without omniscience distinguish between *sincere Christians* and *pretended Ones*, since *true Christians* as distinguished from *Hypocritical Professors* make up no *distinct Society*, have no *visible Tribunal* to which we can address our selves for the Decision of all Controversies in Divine Faith. What signifies all this to the proving *An infallible Judge on Earth*, that is suppos'd to be a *Living Oracle*, whose *Voice* we must all hear, and whose *Decisions* we must submit our Judgment to. For we must already certainly know, What the *true Doctrine* of Christianity is, before we can so much as conjecture who are the Members of this *Invisible Church*. And after all, we can never certainly know, *Whose Faith* is *sincere* and *unfeigned*, unless we cou'd penetrate into their Hearts.

If he mean by the *Church*, *All that make an External Profession of the Christian Faith*, then either this Promise secures the *Infallibility of all such*, or at least of the *Major part* of 'em. If it secures the *Infallibility of all such*, then there cou'd be no such thing as *Damnable Heresies* in the Christian Church at all; (which is contrary to matter of fact). Nay, then all *professed Christians* are *Infallible alike*. Nay, on this supposition, This *Infallible Judge* is confounded with *those for whom he is to Judge*. For to say, That all Christians must submit to

the *Infallible Judgment* of the *Universal Church* is the same thing, as to say, That they must submit to their *own*. Nay, if this Argument be good, all professed Christians are of *one Mind* already in Matters of Divine Faith, and 'tis impossible they shou'd be *otherwise*. If this Promise secure the *Infallibility* of the *Major part*, then has this Promise *fail'd of Accomplishment*. For *contrary Doctrines* even in the *Fundamentals of Christianity* have had at different times the *Majority of Votes* in the *Christian Church*, as in the Case of *Arianism* that once had the *far greater part of Bishops* to espouse it. Now we must not put such a fence on this Promise of our Blessed Saviour as supposes him to have *fail'd* in the *performance* of it. Nay, I may add, That if the *Majority of Numbers*, in the *Christian Church* carry this *Infallibility* along with 'em, the *Romish Church* must no longer pretend to it; since those that *reject her Communion* are far more *numerous* than those that *embrace it*.

If then we shou'd grant, That our Blessed Saviour has here promis'd *That the Power of Hell shall not prevail against his Church*; all that we can understand by it, in consistency with plain Experience in Matter of Fact, is, That our *Saviour* wou'd always preserve a chosen People in the World, that shou'd own him for *the Christ the Son of God*, and adhere to the *Essentials of Christian Faith and Practice*, in opposition to all *Damnable Errors and Wickedness*. And this we grant to be true. But this Concession signifies nothing to the Establishing any *Visible Body or Society of Men* as *infallible Judges* of the *Christian Faith* to all the *rest of the Christian World*; and much less to the proving, That this *Privilege of Infallibility* is *entail'd* upon any *particular Churches* in the *Eastern or Western Division* of the old *Roman Empire*, or in any *other part* of the World. Our Blessed Saviour may have even among those *different Communions* such *sincere Disciples* as adhere to the *Essentials of Christianity*, in *Faith and Practice*, tho' most of 'em shou'd be over-run with a mixture of very *dangerous Errors and Corruptions*. But

3. After all, *This Promise of Christ to his Church has no manner of reference to this Privilege of Infallibility*.

These words of our Saviour do indeed contain the Promise of a *Blessed Immortality* to all that by a *practical Faith* own him for the *true Messiah and the Son of God*, but they signify no such thing as the making 'em *infallible Judges in all Matters* of

of *Divine Faith*. For the words shou'd be render'd the *Gates of Hades*, or the *unseen state of the Dead* *πύλαι αἰδου*. Now tho' that phrase do frequently occur in the *Septuagint* throughout the *Old Testament*, from whence our Saviour here borrow'd it, it never signifies any thing more then *Death*. The *Place* or *Receptacle of the Dead* being compar'd to an *House*, and *Death* represented as the *Gates* that lead to it. So that these words of our Saviour import no more, then a Promise of *Eternal Life* to his *Church* (i. e. to his *Church* as consisting of *sincere Believers*, and distinguish't from all *Hypocritical Pretenders* to the *Christian Faith*). So that from hence to infer, that our Saviour has Constituted an *infallible human Tribunal* in his visible *Church* to *preserve it from Error*, is wholly *alien* from the obvious *Sense* and *Intention* of his words, which was only to assure all his sincere Disciples of an *happy Immortality*. For the *Gates of Hades* do neither in the Language of any *Sacred* nor *Prophane Writer* signify the *Power of Heresie* or *Error*, but only *Death*.

Others of the *Romish Writers*, and especially those that plead for the *Infallibility of General Councils*, lay great stress on those words of our Blessed Saviour's, *XVIII Matth. 15, 16, 17, 18 v. Moreover if thy Brother shall trespass against thee, Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy Brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take one or two more, that in the Mouth of two or three Witnesses every word may be establish'd. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen Man and a Publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven.*

To this it might be sufficient to Answer, That our Blessed Saviour is not here speaking of *Articles of Faith*, but of *Matters of private Offence*. Now in these *Matters* those of the *Romish Church* do not pretend to any *Infallibility* at all: Nor think the *Command of Hearing the Church* obliges us to believe any such thing.

But there needs no more to shew, how absurd the Argument is, which those of the *Romish Church* draw from thence, then to desire 'em to resolve us, *What Church they bere understand*. If they understand a *particular Church*, (or a *Provincial* or *National One*) then if this Passage prove any thing,

thing, it proves *every such particular Church* to be as *infallible* as *that of Rome* pretends to be. If they understand the *Catholick* or *Universal Church*, then in the Case of *private offences*, every *offended Brother*, if he cannot gain his *offending one*, must go and *tell the Universal Church*. But how is this possible? How shall he send intelligence to all the *Christians* throughout *Europe, Asia, Africa* and *America*? How shall he assemble 'em together? Or gather their *Suffrages* and *Votes*? Nay, if we shou'd allow 'em to interpret the Words, not of the *Church Diffusive*, but of what they call the *Church-representative* (i. e. a *General Council*) How shall every *offended Brother* observe our Saviour's Rule? Must he tell such a *General Council*, when there is *no such thing* in Being? Or if there were, Must every such *offended Brother* bring his *Complaints* to them from the remotest part of the *World*? Or shall they be oblig'd to the impossible Task of *hearing* all such *Complaints*? Nay, if we make the *Pope* himself the *Church*, Must every agrieved Christian travel with his *Complaints* against his obstinate Brother as far as *Rome*? 'Tis evident then, that their Interpretation of these words renders our Saviour's Advice most *impracticable* and *absurd*. His Advice may indeed be follow'd among the Members of a *particular Congregation*; but not among those of the *Universal Church*. And therefore to interpret the words concerning the *latter* is not only *groundless* but *ridiculous*.

Others of 'em plead the *Promise* of Christ made to his Apostles of *sending his Holy Spirit* to guide 'em into all Truth. XVI John 13 v.

Ans. Tho' we shou'd allow, That our Saviour here promis'd to his Apostles the *unerring Direction* of his *Holy Spirit* in delivering his Doctrine to the Christian Church, it will by no means thence follow, That any *particular Pastor* or *Bishop*, or the *Majority* of such have the same *unerring Guidance* in every Age. Even those of the *Romish Church* must renounce any such Inference, when they Consider, How vastly *Arrianism* once spread in the Christian Church, and how entirely it carried the *Major Vote* in several successive *Councils*, and some of 'em as *numerous* as any that they falsely call *General ones*; especially when they remember, That *Liberius* one of their own Popes concur'd with 'em. But there is not the same Necessity of the *unerring Conduct* of the

the Holy Spirit to the *Pastors* of the Church in *ucceeding* Ages, since the compleating the Canon of the Holy Scriptures, as there was *before*. If any pretend to it, they shou'd produce such *Credentials* as the Apostles did, I mean that of *Miracles*. But after all, if this Text do annex this Priviledge of *Infallibility* to the *Majority* of *Pastors* in the *Christian Church*, then the Pretensions of the *Romish Church* to it are overthrown. For the *Majority* is *against* 'em.

Others of 'em alledge such Passages as mention the Office of *Christian Pastors*, and the Duty of their *Flocks*, as Proofs of such an *Infallible Authority* in the Church.

And I need do little more for refuting these Arguments, then to recite 'em.

Thus because they suppose *the Church* to be call'd by the *Apostle Paul*, *The Pillar and Ground* (or *Buttress*) of *Truth*, They conclude her to be *Infallible*.

Answer, We must still repeat the Question, What they mean by *the Church*. If they mean *All Christians thro' the World*, Then *They are all Infallible alike*. And where then is the *Tribunal* that *all* must be suppos'd to submit to, when *all* are made *Judges*? If they mean *the Bishop of Rome*, or a *Councill headed by him*, What probable Proof can they give us, That the Apostles so much as thought of 'em in this Passage? For there is no shadow of probability in it. But why may not *the Church* be call'd *the Pillar or Buttress of Truth*, to signify the *Obligation* that lies on *all Christians* to support it? And what *Proof* is that of their *Infallibility*?

But after all, 'tis most reasonable to suppose, That the Apostle does here call *Timothy* himself, and not *the Church* *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*. For he compares here *the Church* to an *House*, And *Timothy* to a *Pillar and Buttress* in it, whom therefore he here advises to *behave himself* suitably to that Character. So that if the Apostle's words prove any one *Infallible*, 'tis *Timothy*. And what signifies his *Infallibility* to the *Bishops of Rome*, or their *Councils*, or to the *Church of Rome* more than that of *Ephesus*, that wou'd have a better pretence to it from this Passage. But the Apostle is not speaking of what *Timothy* was, but of what he and all other *Teachers* shou'd be, viz. *Pillars and Buttresses* (i. e. *Defenders*) of *Truth*. Again, Because *Christian Flocks* are oblig'd to obey their *Spiritual Guides*, * And Our Saviour tells * XIII Heb. 17. his

his Apostles, *That he who hears them hears him; And he that rejects them rejects him.* * Thence they infer, That there must be a *Living Infallible Oracle* in the Church whom all are bound to *hear and obey.*

Answ. If this Argument be of any Force, It proves much more than they intend, because the Duty of *Obeying their Spiritual Guides* concerns *all Christian Flocks* towards their *Pastors*; And consequently if this Argument be good, it supposes *all* of 'em to be *Infallible* alike. But the Truth is, All such *Dutys* on the *People's* part suppose that *Pastors* on their part answer the *Obligations* of their *Office* and *Charge*. They are to be *heard* and *obey'd* so far as they *follow* their *Masters Instructions*, and *deliver his Truths and Laws*, and no farther. And 'tis then, and then only, That to *Reject* them is to *Reject Christ himself*. But this does by no means secure all *Christian Pastors*, or even the *Majority* of 'em from all *Errors* in matters of *Divine Faith*, nor does it oblige their *Flocks* to *receive* whatever they *deliver* with an *Implicit Faith*. Nay, their *Flocks* have a just right to use the same *Liberty* of their private Judgment in reference to the *Doctrine* of their *Pastors*, that the *Bereans* us'd in reference to that of the Apostle *Paul* himself, when they searcht the *Scriptures* to judge from thence whether his *Doctrine* were conformable to 'em. See XVII Acts 11 v. They might altogether as well *Argue*, That the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were *Infallible*, because they sat in the seat of *Moses*, and our Saviour *requires his Disciples to observe and do whatever they commanded 'em*, XXIII Matth. 2. But as these words of Christ must be understood, of *observing* whatever those *Jewish Doctors* commanded in Conformity to the *Divine Law*, and not of whatever they commanded under the pretence of *Oral Tradition*, so must we understand his Precepts of *obeying our Spiritual Guides* under the same *Restriction* and *Limitation*.

Others of 'em argue for the Church's *Infallibility* from the *Promise* of Christ at the end of his Commission to the Apostles, *That he wou'd be with 'em to the end of the World.* XXVIII Matth. 20. From hence one of their late Writers thus reasons "If Christ continues with his Church to the end of
" the World, can it be imagin'd that he wou'd suffer it to fall
" into Error, since we cannot suppose him to have any other
" business to continue with it, then to preserve it from
" that?

Answ.

Ans. The perpetual *Presence* of Christ is here promis'd to the *Apostles*, and to all those *Ordinary Pastors* and *Teachers* that shou'd succeed them in *Teaching* others to observe what he had commanded. But if this Promise secur'd all such *Ordinary Pastors* and *Teachers* from *Errors*, no such *Ordinary Pastors* and *Teachers* cou'd fall into any *Errors* and *Heresies* at all. And so all of 'em must be rendred *Infallible*. How then shall we reconcile this Promise of Christ with the Truth of *Matter of Fact*? Nay, if this Promise be made to the *Universal Church* (i. e. to all *Professed Christians*) then All of 'em are rendred alike *Infallible*. Why then do the *Papists* that are but a *small part* of the *Catholick Church* engross this Priviledge? And how absurd is it to put such a sense upon our Saviour's Promise as common *Experience* shews the palpable *falsehood* of? Our Saviour does not therefore here promise to preserve all *Ordinary Pastors* and *Teachers* from *Erring*, (much less all *Christians*) but to assist 'em in their sincere Enquiries after Divine Truth, and while they deliver his Truths and Laws to accompany the Publication of 'em with the assistances of his Holy Spirit and Grace, in order to their being efficacious on the Souls of all that receive 'em with an humble and sincere Mind, to defend 'em in the Faithful discharge of their Duty, or support 'em under sufferings for it. But he no more promises to preserve all such *Teachers* from all *Error*, then from all *Pride*, or *Passion*, or *Inordinate Love of Secular Honours and Interests*, that are the usual fruitful *Source* of *Errors* in Religion. This Promise therefore supposes in such Pastors their unprejudic'd Enquiry after Truth and Integrity in Embracing and Publishing it; But does by no means assure us, That all such Christian Pastors shall be thus *upright* and *unbias'd*. 'Tis only a *Conditional Promise*, and those only can claim the benefit of it, who do faithfully *Teach what Christ has commanded*, and no farther then they *do so*. And what signifies all this to this Pretence of *Infallibility*?

But what need I insist on Answering *particular Passages* of Scripture, when the Doctrine of such an *Infallible Judge of Controversies* is incapable of any such *Proof* at all? For let the Guides of the *Romish Church* produce as many Texts as they please, I wou'd only enquire, What is it that these Texts are alledg'd to prove? Is it to prove, That *there is some Infallible Judge or other in the Christian Church, from whose*

whose Exposition alone the true sense of the Scriptures must be deriv'd? Here I must then again ask, How shall I know, that this is the real sense of these Texts, and that they do assert such an *Infallible Judge*? If they tell me, that they are so *plain* and *clear in themselves*, that I need only impartially consider 'em to be satisfied concerning this Truth. (Tho' by the way I have shewn that nothing can be more *false* than this *Pretence*) Then it follows, That they may be as *plain* and *clear* in delivering all other *necessary Articles* of the Christian Faith; And so the *Necessity* of such an *Infallible Expositor* and *Judge* is overthrown. But if I cannot know that this is the real sense and meaning of these Texts till this *Infallible Judge* tells me it is, then am I brought into this absurd and ridiculous *Circle*, viz. I must believe, *There is such an Infallible Judge of Controversies*, because the *Scriptures* say, *There is such a one*; and I must believe the *Scriptures* say, *There is such a one*, because this *infallible Judge* tells me so. The short of which is, I must take this *pretended Judge* to be *Infallible on his own Word*. Whereas the Truth of the Matter is, that I must first from the *Scriptures* themselves learn what are the *Essential Doctrines* and *Precepts* of the *Christian Religion*, before I can so much as know *What the Christian Church* is, and *Who* can justly claim to be any *part* of it.

But before I dismiss this Head, it will not be improper to take notice, That we have not only the bare *silence* of the Holy Scriptures concerning any such *Infallible Judge*, to justify our rejecting this vain Pretension of the Church of *Rome*; but we have many things suggested therein that are plainly *inconsistent* with any such Supposition. The Holy Scriptures in asserting their own *perspicuity* and *clearness* in all matters necessary to Salvation, do in effect disclaim the *Necessity* of any such *Infallible Human Judge*.

Again, our Blessed Saviour has forbid any *Pretensions* to such an *Absolute Judicial Authority* in his Church, when he forbid his Apostles themselves to affect so much as the Title of *Rabbi*, or *Master*, telling 'em, *They had only one Master* (of their Religion) viz. *Himself*. XXIII Matth. 10.

And accordingly the Apostles themselves (who if any might pretend to this *Authority* and *Privilege*) do openly disclaim this proud Pretension. *We have* (saith the Apostle Paul to the *Corinthians*: 2 Cor. I. ch. 24 v.) *no Dominion*
over

over your Faith. The Apostle *Peter* charges all succeeding Pastors (And it were to be wish'd that his pretended Successor had better observ'd his solemn Charge) against Usurping any such Dictatorship, forbidding 'em to act as *Lords over God's Heritage*. 1 Pet V. 3.

And whereas the Patrons of the Romish Infallibility do on all occasions exhort the *Laiety* to submit to what they call the Judgment of the Church (i. e. of the *Clergy*) and caution 'em against trusting their own Eyes or Judgment in matters of Divine Faith; We see that the Apostles quite contrary call upon 'em, *Not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits* * *To prove all things, and hold fast that which is good* *. The * I John IV. 1. Apostle *Paul* tells 'em, *That if either he, or an Angel from Heaven preach'd any other Gospel, they were to account them Accursed*. * I Thess. V. 21. Nay, he commends the *Bereans* for what those * I Gal. 8. of the Romish Church take for a mark of an Heretical Disposition, viz. *For searching the Scriptures to know whether his Doctrine were consonant thereto*. * Now any one may see, * XVII. Acts 11. how improper and dangerous these Advices were on supposition that there had been an *Infallible Judge of Controversies*, to whose Definitions in matters of Divine Faith all Christians ow'd an *absolute Submission*. Any one may see, how much surer and shorter way it had been to have sent 'em to such an *Unerring Oracle* to have learn't the Truth from his Mouth, then to send 'em to search it out themselves in the *Holy Scriptures*. The *Guides of the Romish Church* give very different Advice to their *Profelytes*, and very suitable to their own Principles:

We see then there is no *Evidence from Scripture* of any such *Infallible Judge of Controversies*, that can claim a *Dominion over our Faith*, but the clearest and strongest *Presumptions* to the contrary.

But this is the least part of the Charge I have to bring against this Doctrine, For I now come,

II. To shew, *That the Asserting such an infallible Judge and Tribunal on Earth in matters of Divine Faith is a false and pernicious Principle that subverts the Foundation of Christianity*.

And this is not the only Instance wherein the Principles of Popery are subversive of Christianity.

You have in the *Discourse of Transubstantiation* justly shewn, That that Doctrine destroys all the *Evidence* we can have of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, or indeed of any *Divine Revelation* at all.

Their *Invocation of Angels and Saints*, and *Worship of Images* have reviv'd that *Pagan Idolatry* which it was the great Design of the Gospel to extirpate.

Their *False* and *Fabulous Miracles* have done all that is possible to weaken the Credit of those *true Miracles* by which the Gospel was confirm'd at it's first Publication.

And I have the same Observation to make concerning this *Doctrine of an Human Infallible Judge of Controversies in the Church*, that the supposition of it has effectually decided the Grand *Dispute* between Us and the *Jews* against our Blessed Saviour himself.

To clear the force of this Argument, I must premise, that those of the *Romish Church* do all along argue for such an *Infallible Judge of Controversies* from the *absolute Necessity* of such a Judge to end all Disputes in Religion, and to preserve the Divine Truth in the Church to the end of the World. And they suppose the *Necessity* of it to extend to all Ages. Nay, they themselves do argue for the *Necessity* of such an *Unerring Judge of Controversies* in the *Christian Church* from the Constitution of such a One in the *Jewish*. And accordingly they alledge those Passages in the Old Testament that seem to require an *absolute Submission* in the *Jews* to the Judgment of their *High Priest* and their *Sanedrim* (or *Supreme Council*) as a *Proof* of the like *absolute Submission* due from all *Christians* to this *Infallible Judge* which they suppose to be set up in the *Catholick Church*. Thus those celebrated Authors, *Bellarmino*,^a *Beccanus*,^b *Melchior Canus*,^c *Gretzer*^d (not to mention many more) assert, "That all the *Jews* were bound to stand to the Judgment of their *High-Priest* and *Sanedrim*, whatever it was, and to take that for the Law of God which they taught to be so. But we need not in this matter be beholden to their *free Confession*. Because 'tis evident that the *Jews* had as plausible Texts for the *Infallibility* of *their Church* as the *Papists* can alledge to prove the *Infallibility* of the *Christian Church*.

Do the *Papists* alledg Christ's Command to us to *hear the Church*? and telling his Disciples, *That he who heard them heard him, and he who rejected them rejected him*?

I shall not now repeat what I observ'd before, how ridiculous it is to apply the former of these Passages to the *Universal Church*, I shall only shew, That these words are not near

^a De Verb. Dei

Interpr. lib.

3. c. 4.

^b De Jud. Con-

trov. lib. 1.

c. 5. nu. 62.

^c Oper. lib. 6.

p. 510.

^d Det. Bellarm.

lib. 3. c. 4.

near so clear a Proof of an Infallible Judge in the Christian Church, as those remarkable words of *Moses* are, That such an *Infallible Judge* was set up by God in the Jewish Church. XVII Deut. 8, 9, &c. *If there arise a matter too hard for thee in Judgment, between Blood and Blood, between Plea and Plea, &c. being matters of Controversie in thy Gates, Then shalt thou arise and get thee up into the Place which the Lord thy God shall choose; And thou shalt come to the Priests, the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those Days, and enquire, and they shall shew thee the Sentence of Judgment. And thou shalt do according to the Sentence which they of that Place, (which the Lord shall choose) shall shew thee; And thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee. According to the Sentence of the Law which they shall teach thee, and according to the Judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do. Thou shalt not decline from the Sentence which they shall shew thee to the right hand or the left. And the Man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the Priest that stands to Minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the Judge, even that Man shall dye, and thou shalt put away the Evil from Israel, And all the People shall hear and fear and do no more presumptuously. (And by the way, 'tis obvious what Triumphs the Romish Church wou'd make, had they any such Text as this to plead for an absolute Submission to the Judgment of a Pope, or a General-Council, and to justify their severity against such as reject their Decisions).*

Again, Did our Blessed Saviour promise to his Apostles his Holy Spirit to guide 'em into all Truth? So did God promise to put the Spirit of *Moses* upon the seventy Elders. XI Numb. 17.

Did our Saviour promise to be with his Church for ever? So had God said of *Zion* of old, *This is my Rest for ever, and here will I dwell.* CXXXII Ps. 13, 14. So 2 Chron. VII. 16. And there were manifold Promises of his perpetual Presence with his People at *Jerusalem*.

Do they alledge the Apostle's Command to Christian Flocks to Obey their Rulers, following their Faith? So might the Jewish Church plead, *That the Priests Lips were to preserve knowledge, and the People were to seek the Law at his Mouth.* *

* II Matth. 7.

Did our Saviour promise, *That he wou'd build his Church on a Rock, and the Gates of Hell shou'd not prevail against it?* So had God promis'd, *That his Covenant with the Priests and Le-*

vites and Ministers shou'd be as perpetual as Day and Night. XXXIII Jer. 20. 21. So had he declar'd, that his Mount Sion (the Jewish Church) shou'd not be mov'd but abide for ever.

So that the Jewish Church had from these and the like Promises altogether as specious a Pretence to Infallibility as any can alledge in behalf of the Christian Church; Nay, a far better pretence then the Romish Church ever had.

Having premis'd this, I now come to the Argument I wou'd draw from it. We Read at the XIV Mark 53 v. That our Saviour was led away to the High-Priest, and that with him were assembled the Chief-Priests, and Elders, and Scribes. The Jewish was then the only Visible Church in the World. (And that is what the Romish Church can with no manner of reason or modesty pretend unto). Now here was the Visible Head of the Visible Church, viz. The High-Priest. Here were the undoubted Representatives of it, The Chief-Priests, and Elders, and Scribes, the supreme Council of their Church and Nation, in whom the Highest Authority was lodg'd, and to whom this Privilege of Infallibility did belong (if it belong to the Visible Church-Catholick at all). Here comes before 'em a Controversy of the highest Importance and Moment imaginable, viz. Whether our Lord Jesus was the Christ or Messiah? (that seed of Abraham in whom all Nations were to be blessed, that Son of David that shou'd inherit his Throne, That Saviour of the World, whose coming the Prophets had foretold, and the Body of the Jewish Nation then expected?) They propose the Question to our Lord himself, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? To which he answers, I am. (Nor is this the first time that they had his Case and his Pretensions under their Consideration as we may see from VII John 45. X John 22). But here they come to a final decisive Sentence concerning him, which upon mature deliberation they unanimously agree in. This great and important Truth which our Saviour then made an open Confession of, [viz. That he was the Christ] they adjudg'd to be Blasphemy. The High-Priest Proposes the Question, Ye have heard the Blasphemy, what think ye? And they all condemn'd him to be guilty of Death. *

* XIV Match.
64.

Here then we find all the Ingredients of what those of the Church of Rome account an Infallible Tribunal in the Visible Church. Here is the High-Priest, Here is the Jewish Sanhedrim

drim that were incomparably more the true *Representatives* of the *Jewish*, then ever any pretended *General Council* was of the *Christian Church*. Nay, if the *Majority* of the *People's Votes* and *Consent* could signify any thing to make 'em more *Infallible*, here was the *Concurrence* of the *Church-Diffusive* with the *Judgment* of the *Church Representative* and the *Head* of it. For the *Body* of that *Unbelieving Nation* approv'd the *Judgment* of their *Sanedrim*. Our Blessed Saviour having among 'em only a *few* (and those but *obscure* and *inconsiderable*) *Persons* for his *Disciples* and *Followers*. If then this *Doctrine* of the *Papists* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Church* be true, this *Fundamental Article* of our *Christian Faith* is no better then *Blasphemy*. The *Christian Religion* is no better then a *pernicious Heresy*. The *Author* of it was justly put to *Death* as a *Blasphemer* and *Deceiver*. And his *Followers* were no better then *Rebels* against the *Churches Authority*, whom therefore she justly *Condemn'd* as *pestilent Hereticks*.

And now shall we make that *Doctrine* (*viz.* of the *Churches Infallibility*) an *Article* of the *Christian Religion* that so manifestly *overthrows* the very *Foundation* of it? That so openly *justifies* this *Condemning Sentence* past on the *Son of God*? That *overturns* that *Grand Truth* on which the *Christian Church* is built? That *brands* all the *Followers* of the Blessed *Jesus* for as notorious *Church Rebels* and *Hereticks* as ever the *Church of Rome* accounted those to be that disown her *Authority* and reject her *Decisions*? Here the matter is brought to a short issue, either this *great Cause* of *Christianity*, or that of *Popery*, must *fall to the Ground*. Either the *Visible Church* has no such *perpetual Infallible Tribunal* on *Earth*; or else, our *Saviour* himself stands *justly Condemn'd* at *their Bar*.

The *Force* of this *Argument* is so clear and strong, that it has tempted some of our *Adversaries* to use strange and detestable *Language* concerning this *Sentence* of the *Jewish Sanedrim*. It made *Melchior Canus*^a say, *That this Action of their's was indeed contrary to Christ, but their Sentence was most true and profitable, yea, a Divine Oracle*. And *Harding*^b tells us, *That the Arts of that Council were wicked, but the Sentence whereby they Condemn'd Christ was just and true*. We see in this Instance, what *desperate Shifts* a wretched Cause will drive it's *Defenders* to. For if the *Sentence* of the *Jewish Sanedrim* was *just and true*, then was our *Saviour* a *Blasphe-*

^a Oper. lib. 5.

c. ult. p. 283.

^b Agst. Jewel's

Apol. c. 6.

Div. 3. par.

6.

Blasphemer for pretending to be the *Christ the Son of God*, and deserv'd to *Dye* for that *Blasphemy*. And what then must we think of *his Religion* and *his Followers*?

I know but one plausible *Evasion* that can be us'd to avoid the force of this Argument. And that is, That the *Miracles* of Christ did justify his Followers in refusing to submit to the judgment of the *Jewish Sanedrim*; And this Extraordinary Evidence of his Divine Mission did sufficiently warrant their Embracing his Doctrine, tho' condemn'd by the *supreme Authority* of the then *Visible Church*.

But that this is but a vain *Evasion* will easily appear, if we consider, That *Miracles* alone *abstractedly* consider'd were no sufficient Evidence of his *Divine Mission*. God himself had requir'd 'em, *If any Prophet shou'd rise up and work signs and wonders to draw 'em thereby to Idolatry, Not to hearken to him.* XIII Deut. 1, 2, 3 v. Now those who had then the Government of the *Visible Church* in their hands, And in whom this Priviledge of *Infallibility* is suppos'd to be lodg'd, had seen and consider'd these Eminent Works of Christ, and had adjudg'd 'em to be *false Miracles*, not perform'd by a *Divine*, but a *Diabolical Power*, even by the Assistance of *Beelzebub the Prince of Devils*. And therefore if the People ow'd an *absolute Submission* to their Judgment as *Infallible*, They ought to have look'd on these *Miracles* as no convincing Proof of his being the true *Messiah*, and were bound to reject his Pretensions notwithstanding this seeming Evidence of a Divine Mission. For who cou'd be suppos'd more capable to judg of the Characters that belong'd to the true *Messiah*, and of the Truth or Falshood of his pretended *Miracles* themselves then this *Unerring Tribunal* of their Church? We may see what apprehensions they themselves had of the matter, when they rebuk'd the Officers that refus'd to bring our Lord to 'em with that Language so sutable to the Principles of the Romish Church, *Are ye also deceiv'd? Have any of the Rulers or the Pharisees believ'd on him? But this People (q, d this ignorant Laity) that knows not the Law are accursed* VII John 47, 48, 49.

Nay, the *Jewish Sanedrim* wanted not some specious Arguments to alledg for their Rejecting our Blessed Saviour, notwithstanding his *Miracles*, and such as seem unanswerable according to the current Doctrine of the Church of Rome. The *Romish Church* reckons *Oral Traditions* of Equal Authority

Authority with the Holy Scriptures. Now the Jews had 3 *Traditions* in their Church concerning the Messiah ; One was concerning his Temporal Kingdom and Reign ; The second was, That *Elias* the *Thisbite* was to appear personally before the Coming of their *Messiah* ; And a third was that the Law of *Moses* was to be perpetually binding, and the Messiah shou'd enforce the Observance of it upon the *Gentiles*. (And to these I might add a fourth, That *no Prophet* shou'd arise out of *Galilee*).

Now since none of these *Traditions* of their Church agreed to our Blessed Saviour ; And since according to those of the *Romish Church* an equal Reverence is to be pay'd to the *Unwritten Traditions* of the Church as to the *written Word*, The Jews had a Plausible Pretence to reject our Saviour notwithstanding his Miracles. And these *Miracles* (according to the current Doctrine of the *Romish Church*) cou'd be no sufficient Ground for the Laity among'em to oppose the Judgment of their Church in this point declar'd by the mouth of her *supreme and Infallible Tribunal*. Nay, if the *Head and Representatives* of that Church cou'd err in so important a matter as this ; If in such a *Capital Point* as this (on which their own salvation, and that of all that adher'd to their Judgment depended) They did so fatally mistake the *Christ of God* and the *Saviour of the World* for an *Impostor* and *Blasphemer*, All their Boasts of an *infallible Authority* are at an end.

The Controversy is then brought to a short issue, Either our *Blessed Saviour* was no better then a *Blasphemer*, Or this pretended *Infallible Tribunal* of the Visible Church is *overthrown*.

I now proceed farther ;

III To shew, That the *Zealous Asserters* of this *supreme infallible Human Tribunal*, this *Living Judge of Controversies* in the *Visible Church*, entertain such contradictory *Opinions* concerning it, as render this *Opinion* as *useless and insignificant* as 'tis *false and pernicious*.

And sure never were the Builders of *Babel* of old more confounded in their Language, then the great Defenders of this *Infallible Tribunal* are in their's when they are put to it, to tell us, *Who this unerring Judge of Controversies is ?* The Confusion and Contrariety of their Answers to so plain a Question wou'd put one in Mind of that *Vial* poured on the
Seat

Seat of the Beast, that rendred his Kingdom full of Darkneſs.
XVI Rev. 10.

It there be in the *Viſible Church-Catholick* ſuch an *infallible Tribunal*, ſuch a *Living and Unerring Oracle of Truth* and *Judge of Controverſies*, ſure this grand *Priviledge* and *Autherity* is not a meer *Caſtle in the Air* ; We may come to ſome certain knowledge *in whom* this *ſupreme Authority* is veſted, *And to whom* this glorious *Priviledge of Infallibility* does belong.

They tell us indeed in general, That this *Infallibility* is lodg'd in the *Catholick Church*. But what ſignifies all this when they never once tell us, What they mean by the *Catholick* or *Univerſal Church*.

The *Univerſal Church* may be conſider'd, Either as *meaſur'd by the Unerring Judgment of God*, or by the *Charitable but fallible judgment of Men*.

The *Catholick* or *Univerſal Church*, as *meaſur'd by the Unerring Judgment of God*, includes all that *believe the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Faith*, and *sincerely obey the Laws of Chriſt*. All that are *Regenerated* and *animated by his Holy Spirit*, *sincerely conſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant*, and are *begotten to the Living hope of the Heavenly Inheritance*. Theſe are the *mystical Body of Chriſt*. To them all the glorious *Promiſes* and *Priviledges* do belong that have any neceſſary connexion with *Eternal Salvation*. And (if that will do the *Church of Rome* any ſervice) We freely grant, That the *Members* of this *Catholick Church* (tho liable to many leſſer *Errors*, yet) never *actually err* in the *Fundamentals* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, at leaſt while they continue ſuch. But then this *Catholick Church* is *Inviſible* with reſpect to that *sincere Faith* and *Holineſs*, which conſtitute Men the *Members* of it. And they are not diſtinguiſhable in our Eyes from that vaſt multitude of *Hypocrites* that make a *Profeſſion* of the ſame *Faith* and *Holineſs*, and live in the ſame *External Communion* of the *Viſible Church*. And therefore ſince theſe true Saints make up no *External Collective Body* or *Society* apart by themſelves, but are mix'd with the *Hypocrites* (as the *Sound Wheat* is mix'd with *blaſted Ears* and with *Tares* in the ſame *Field*) they can have no peculiar *Viſible Tribunal* of their own to be the *Seat of Infallibility*. And there is no *Appeal* can be made to them as a *diſtinct Body* for deciding any *Controverſies* in Religion by us who cannot penetrate into their *Hearts*.

For

For the *Catholick Church* as measur'd by a Judgment of *human Charity*, it must include *all that make an External Profession of believing the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith, and obeying the Laws of Christ*. Now this is that *Visible Church* in which those of the *Romish Communion* suppose this *infallible human Tribunal* to be erected.

But here we must enquire, What those *necessary or essential Articles of the Christian Faith* are ?

Now if that which is commonly call'd the *Apostle's Creed*, does contain all the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith (as the antient Fathers did with an unanimous Consent declare it did). * Nay, if the *Apostle's Creed* as explain'd by the *Nicene* be allow'd to contain a sufficient *Summary* of those necessary Articles, then we must suppose this *Infallibility* to be lodg'd in that *Body of professed Christians* who declare their adherence to the *Apostolical* or *Nicene Creeds*. But what shall we understand by all this ? Is it, that *all particular Christians* that profess to receive those two Creeds are thereby constituted *Infallible Judges* in matters of Divine Faith ? No, this is what those of the *Church of Rome* do not pretend to assert. Or is it, That the *Majority* of those who profess to receive those two Creeds are *infallible Judges* to all the rest ? No, this they will by no means allow. For then the *Greek* and all other *Eastern Churches*, all those in *Ethiopia*, nay, all the *Protestant Churches* themselves will come in for a share of this *Infallibility*. And that wou'd utterly ruin the Pretensions of the *Romish Church*, which tho' the far *Minor* part, are yet resolv'd to monopolize this glorious Priviledge to themselves. Besides these *Eastern*, and *Southern*, and *Western Churches* (that make up no part of the *Romish Communion*) have no *common Tribunal* set up among 'em to refer their different Tenets in Religion to the Decision of. They have no *Living Oracle* whom either *all* or the *Majority* of 'em owns and appeal to as the *Arbiter of their Faith*. Nay, whereas the *Romanists* pretend a perpetual necessity of such a *Living Judge* in every Age, there has been no such *Infallible Judge* own'd by the *Majority* of the *Christian Church* for these *thousand Years*. To what purpose then is all this noise about such an *Infallible Tribunal* in the *Catholick Church* when the *Major* part of the Christian World knows nothing of it, and own no such Judge at all ?

* See Dr. Wits-
by's Treatise
of Tradition-
ons.

The Mystery of the matter is this (and sure 'tis a *Mystery of Iniquity* if ever there was any such thing) That tho' all the *Eastern* and *Southern*, and all the *Protestant Churches* do receive all the *Articles of Faith* which the *ancient Churches* thought *necessary to Salvation*, yet *they are no part of the Catholick Church*. But why are they no part of the Catholick Church? Is the *Christian Faith* alter'd from what it was 16 or 1700 years ago? Will not the *Belief of the same Creeds* give a Man as good a Title now to be a *Member of the same Catholick Church* as it wou'd so long ago? Or do their peevish Separations from each other on the account of *lesser differences in Opinion and Practice* exclude 'em from being all Members of that *Catholick Church*, which is made up of all that profess the *Belief of the fore-said Essentials of Christianity* and *Subjection to our Blessed Lord* as the only *Universal Head* thereof? As if the *Subjects* of the same Prince might not have some particular *Feuds and Factions* among themselves, while all own his Authority. But let us say what we please, the *Romish Church* is resolv'd, tho' against common Sense, to engross the *Pompous Title of the Catholick Church* to it self. They that at most can only pretend to be a *Part* (and who are indeed the most *corrupt and degenerate part*) of the *Catholick Church*, will right or wrong set up to be the *Whole*. And you must upon their bare word, and in defiance of all the ancient *Symbols of Christianity*, take all the *Eastern*, and *Southern*, and all the *Protestant Churches* (to whom the *Romish Church* bears no proportion in point of *Numbers*) for *Damnable Hereticks*, tho' they profess to receive all the *ancient Summaries of the Christian Faith*. So that unless we will renounce all *Christian Charity*, and at one Blow cut off all these Churches from any *Visible Relation to our Blessed Saviour*, unless we will swallow this gross Contradiction of taking the *Roman* to be the *Catholick Church* (i. e. a *part for the Whole, A Member, and a very corrupt and putrified One too, for the entire Body*) unless I say, we grant this *Palpable Absurdity*, All Dispute about the *perpetual Infallibility of the Universal Church* is at an end. And sure we are put upon hard Terms when we must renounce *Catholick Charity* before we can embrace the *Catholick Faith*, or tell what it is.

But

But for once, let this gross Absurdity pass. If the *Romish* be the *Catholick Church*, sure we shall at least find the Doctors of that Church agreed, *where* this *infallible Authority* is lodg'd, and *where* this *Supreme Unerring Tribunal* is erected, that we may know whom to appeal to as the Church's *Living Oracle* in all Controverted Articles of Religion. But alas, we are here as much at a loss as ever. For the Wisdom of that God (who is the only Lord of Conscience, and unerring Judge in matters of Religion by his own Sacred Oracles) has here so confounded the different Pretensions of those that wou'd Usurp his Throne, and *Lord it over his Heritage*, that this *infallible Authority* which they boast of as the certain means of ending all Controversies in Religion, is it self the Subject of the warmest Controversies among themselves, and (as far as one can guess) is like to be a matter of Dispute among 'em, till Christ himself shall come *to destroy this Man of Sin with the breath of his Mouth, and the brightness of his Appearance.*

If we will believe the most numerous and considerable part of the *Romish Church*, the *Bishop of Rome* is this *Infallible Judge*. He is the Church's Living and Perpetual Oracle, to whose Decision we must submit in matters of Divine Faith. And by our Saviour's Command of *hearing the Church*, we must understand the *Pope*, the only Unerring Head of it, who (as one of 'em declares) *carries all Truth and the whole of the Divine Law in the Cabinet of his own Breast.*

But then if this *Infallibility* be lodg'd in the *Pope* it seems a very natural Consequence, that all those who deny it must be guilty of Damnable *Heresy*. For what can be a more pernicious *Herese* then to reject the Authority of the only Living Oracle in the Church. But then this will fall very hard upon the whole *Gallican Church*, among whom the Papal Infallibility is no current Doctrine at all. And they wou'd be loath to pass for *Hereticks*, having discover'd as flaming a Zeal as any of their Neighbours for what they call the *Catholick Faith*. Nor dare the *Roman Bishops* brand them for Hereticks on this account, for fear of losing to considerable a part of their Dominions. Especially since they are content to own the *Pope's Primacy* as the Head of the Church, tho' they disown his Infallibility.

And the truth is, the Opposers of the *Papal Infallibility* among 'em produce shrewd Arguments against it, and such

as the Zealous Defenders of it can never be able to Answer. To this purpose they alledge several notorious Instances of *Roman Popes* that have grossly err'd even in the Fundamental Articles of Religion. Thus *Pope John the 23d.* was charg'd with denying the *Immortality of the Soul*, and the rewards of a *Life to come*, by no less Authority then that of one of their General Councils, viz. that of *Constance*. *Pope Gregory the 12th*, and *Benedict the 13th*, were depos'd as *Hereticks* by the Council of *Pisa*. And so was *Eugenius the 4th* by that of *Basil*. And long before that, their own Historians cannot deny, that *Pope Liberius* Subscrib'd the *Arrian* Council of *Syrmium*. And the Pretence of his doing it out of fear will not help the matter. For besides that he declares his Subscription to the Council to be free and voluntary, Who wou'd rely on that Man's *Infallibility* whom either *Fear* or *Interest* cou'd prevail on to prevaricate in an essential Article of the Christian Faith? And sure at least *Pope Adrian the 6th* must be allow'd to be an *Heretick* for asserting, That a *Pope* might err in matters of Faith, and that several of his Predecessors had been *Hereticks*. For if this *Pope's* Assertion be true, There's an end of their Pretensions to *Infallibility*. If it be false, 'tis then as certain, That a *Pope* may err in matters of Faith if the *Pope's* *Infallibility* be any matter of Faith at all.

But besides these, We Protestants have two obvious Arguments against *Papal Infallibility* that lye level to every Man's Understanding.

The One is drawn from the monstrous Wickedness of the Roman Popes for several successive Ages. Our Saviour gives us a certain Rule for distinguishing false Prophets from true ones, that by their Fruits we shall know 'em. VII Matt. 15, 16, 17, &c.

Now I am sure, a Pretence to *Infallibility* in matters of Divine Faith is every way equivalent to a Pretence to *Prophetick Inspiration*. For this *Infallibility* is no *Natural* or *Acquired* but a *Supernatural* Gift. Now let us Consider, what a Character their own Historians give us of the *Roman Popes*.

'Tis well known that *Genebrard* speaking of the Ninth and Tenth Ages tells us, That the *Roman Popes* were fallen from the vertue of their Predecessors being *Apostatical* rather than *Apostolical*. * Nay, *Baronius* their great Flatterer cou'd not forbear thus freely to utter his thoughts. * That ugly

* Gen. Chron. Lib. 4. ad Ann. 901.
* Bar. Annal. ad Ann. 900 Sect. I.

* That ugly Monsters

Monsters were thrust into the Papacy, that it was daub'd with *Dung*, infected with *stink*, defil'd with *filthiness*, and collow'd by these *Persons* with a perpetual *Infamy*. And again ad Ann. 912. At Rome the most powerful and sordid Whores did Rule, at whose Wills the Sees were chang'd and Bishops made; and what is horrid to hear and not to be mention'd, Their Gallants were thrust into St. Peter's Chair, false Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of Roman Popes, but only for the marking out of those Times. (Let me only observe by the way, that for all these hard words, if these very *Monsters* were not true Popes, their Line of Succession is broke). But alas the matter was not much mended in the succeeding Ages. For it were endless to reckon up all those Popes whom their own Historians brand for *Incest*, for *Sodomy*, for *Adultery* and *Fornication*, for *Simony*, for *Witchcraft*, for *Murder*, (even that of *Poysoning their Predecessors*), for insatiable *Covetousness*, for *Perjury* and *Perfidiousness*, for *Luciferian Pride*, and Embroiling all Europe in Wars to support their haughty Pretensions, and above all, for an Incurable Aversion to the Reformation of the grossest Abuses in their own Courts, when all Europe complain'd of 'em. Now when we Consider these hideous Characters given of the generality of their own Popes, even by those Historians that have been Zealous Advocates for their pretended Authority, we cannot but stand amazed, that ever so strange and stupid a thought shou'd enter into the minds of Men, as to take such *Monsters* of Villany and Wickedness for *Infallible Judges* in all matters of Divine Faith. We Read indeed of *Holy Men* speaking as they were mov'd by the *Holy Ghost*. But can we ever think that the *Holy Spirit* shou'd guide those infallibly into all Truth whom their Lusts hurried into all manner of abominable Vices? Strange, that the unerring Light of Divine Truth shou'd perpetually shine in their Heads, whose Hearts and Lives were the sink of all Impiety and Polution! That such *Incarnate Fiends* shou'd be the *Living Oracles* of God! and that the *Divine Spirit* shou'd be oblig'd to preserve those from all Error whom the *Infernal Spirit* had fill'd with all wickedness! This is a *Paradox* indeed which those may believe who pin their Faith upon the *Priests Sleeve*, but will never enter into the thoughts of any that have not wilfully clos'd their Eyes against all means of Conviction.

The other Argument is drawn from the notorious Ignorance of Roman Popes. All the World knows that the Popes are not ordinarily chosen with respect to their *Learning* or *Capacity* any more then with respect to their *Piety* or *Vertues*, but by the Interest of Popish Princes, or their Art to manage the Factions among the Cardinals. Accordingly nothing is more usual then for the Election to fall upon those that are far better vers'd in *Ecclesiastical Policy* and their *Canon-Law*, then in the *Holy Scriptures*. And therefore such Popes are wholly at a loss when any Controversies in Divinity are brought before 'em. Thus it was with Pope Innocent the 10th, when through the importunity of the Jesuits he was prevail'd upon to interpose his Judgment about the Writings of *Jansenius*. He plainly Confess'd, That he understood not those matters. For (said he) *I am a Canonist but no Divine.* And the same Pope gives the like account of his Predecessor Clement the 8th, That after he had both heard the same Controversy Debated by the best Divines, and had studied it himself, he knew not what to determine in it, but thought it most advisable to impose perpetual Silence on both the Contending Partys. And yet these very Popes that so ingenuously profess their own Ignorance, and that dare hardly meddle with such thorny Questions in Divinity for fear of pricking their own Fingers with 'em, must be deem'd the *Infallible Living Oracles* of the Church and the *Unerring Judges* of those Articles of Religion, which they own they never studied or understood.

* See St. A-
mour's Jour-
nal, &c. part
3d c. 12.

And we need go no farther then the Instance I just now mention'd to shew, how little the Pope's Infallibility is regarded in the Romish Church it self. For when Pope Innocent the 10th was prevail'd on by the unwearied Sollicitation of the Jesuits to Condemn the *Five Propositions* suppos'd to be in *Jansenius's* Book, did his Decision put an end to the Controversy? Nothing less. For the Followers of *Jansenius* pretended, That the Pope mistook the true Sense of *Jansenius's Propositions*, and therefore his Decision proceeding upon a mistake in *Matter of Fact* (*viz.* the true Sense of that Author) was no way obligatory to them. And why shou'd we take him for an Infallible Expofitor of the true Sense of the *Inspired Penmen* of the Bible, whom themselves suppose capable to mistake the Sense of any other *Theological Writer*? How shall he unerringly decide all Religious

Contro-

Controversies in the Church that may mistake the true Sense of the *Propositions* lay'd before him to be *Approv'd* or *Condemn'd* by him ?

But tho' the *Roman Pope* may err, perhaps we may find this *Infallible Authority* lodg'd in those they call *General Councils*. And here we may expect to meet with that *Living Oracle* and *Unerring Judge* we are in quest of. For here the *Gallican Church* pretends the *Seat of Infallibility* to be found.

But then it must be Consider'd, That if the *Infallibility of a General Council* be an *Article of Faith*, the generality of the *Roman Popes*, and the far greater part of the *Romish Church* are all *Héreticks*. For *General Councils* are reckon'd *Fallible* at *Rome*; and their *Decisions* and *Decrees* are reckon'd to derive all their *Infallibility* from the Approbation of the *Pope* that *Living Oracle* of the Church there.

And they want not shrewd Arguments to justify their Doctrine of the *Fallibility of General Councils*. To this purpose they justly alledge those *Arrian Councils* at *Arimini* and *Syrmium* which were far more numerous than that at *Nice*, and yet determin'd in favour of the *Arrian Cause*. So that if *General Councils* have this Priviledge of *Infallibility*, the *Arrian Creed* has a much better Authority to plead then the *Nicene*. Besides they alledge the frequent contrariety of the *Decisions of General Councils* in matters of *Faith*, that are so obvious to all who are in the least acquainted with *Church History*.

But we Protestants have an untoward Objection against their Constituting *General Councils* the *Infallible Judges* in all matters of divine Faith, viz. That the Asserters of this *Infallible Tribunal* in the Church plead for the *perpetual Necessity* of it in every Age, because they reckon it the *necessary Remedy* against all *Errors* and *Heresies*. But how can that be, when there was *no such thing* as what they now call a *General Council* ever heard or thought of for above three hundred years in the Christian Church? When the Calling of such a *Council* depended on a meer Unforeseen Accident, viz. the Advancement of *Constantine* to the Imperial Throne? Nay, how can we suppose the *perpetual Necessity* of such a *General Council*, when there has often been none for above two hundred years together? And 'tis now above one hundred and fifty years since the last that assum'd that Name, viz. That of *Trent*? And as far as we can judge of the *Intentions* of the *Popes* that are to succeed by the *Inclinations* of

of their *Predecessors* we are like to see *no such thing* as one of their *General Councils* for as many years yet to come. And can we think this grand Privilege of *Infallibility* (so necessary as they pretend for the security of the Christian Faith in every Age) to be lodg'd in a *Thing* that does *not Exist at all*, and no man can tell whether it ever *will Exist again*? Must this perpetual *Living Oracle* be *dumb* for so many Ages together? Must it depend on the meer Pleasure of Popes or Princes whether it shall ever *speak again* at all? The Decrees of *past Councils* are as liable to be misinterpreted and misunderstood as the Holy Scriptures, and there is the same need of an *infallible Expofitor* to assure us of the sense of the *One* as of the *other*. So that to place this *Infallibility* in *General Councils* runs 'em upon the same *Inconveniencys* they would pretend to avoid, by denying, That the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures is the *Infallible Judge* of Controversies. A *Council* that is long since *past* and *gone*, and may never be conven'd again for any thing we can foresee, is no *Living* and *Perpetual Judge*.

There are indeed some others of the *Roman Church* who seem desirous to *compromise* this matter; and therefore wou'd place this *Infallibility* neither in the *Pope alone*, nor in a *General Council alone*, but in *both together*, and accordingly they suppose the *Decrees* of *General Councils* to be *Infallible* when *Confirm'd by the Bishop of Rome*.

But this Opinion is liable to the same Objection as the former, that there has been *no Pope and Council* in Conjunction this 150 Years, and probably we may wait many more before we shall see such a *Show* again. And what then becomes of this *Living Oracle*, this *perpetual Judge* of *Controversies* in the Church? To what *Tribunal* must we in this Age appeal if any new Controversies in Religion be started? The Church has now *no such Tribunal*, and we know not, whether it *will have any more* such to the end of the World. And what then is become of its boasted *Infallibility*?

But this Opinion of Placing the *Infallibility* in a *Pope and Council together*, is (if possible) an *absurder* Pretence than either of the *two* former. Thus for Instance, The *Council of Trent* drew up several *Decisions* in matters of Faith. And at the Conclusion of their Session, they presented 'em to the *Pope* for his *Confirmation*. Now I wou'd demand when the Council had form'd their Decrees, were they *Infallible* in their

their *Decisions* or no? *If they were*, then the *Council alone* is *Infallible*. But this the *Pope* and the greater part of the *Romish Church* will by no means own. *If they were not*, then how comes the *Popes Approbation* to render 'em *Infallible* when the *Pope* himself may *err*? How comes the *Council* never to gain *Infallibility* till they have *lost* their *Existence*? Nay, how comes the *Pope* that is suppos'd to be *Fallible* in his *own Decrees* to be *Infallible* in *Confirming the Decrees of others*? As if he cou'd be *Infallible* in *seeing with other Mens Eyes*, who may be *deceiv'd* in *seeing with his own*?

Besides this Pretension is entirely destroy'd by the *contrary Decisions of Popes and Councils* when in *Conjunction*, and that in reference to this Capital Point of *Supreme Infallible Authority*. For we have in two *General Councils* and both *Headed by Roman Popes* (*viz.* that of *Basil* and *Constance*) the *Superiority of a Council above the Pope* declar'd. And I am sure, wherever the *Supreme Authority* is lodg'd, this *Privilege of Infallibility* must according to them follow it. And yet by two other *Councils*, and those *Headed by Roman Popes* (*viz.* that of *Florence* and the last *Lateran Council*) the *Superiority of a Pope above a General Council* is Declar'd. Now where to place this *Supreme Infallible Authority* is among them the most important matter of *Faith*, being (as they suppose) absolutely necessary to all certainty in the *Christian Religion*. And yet in the *Decision* of this grand Point, *A Pope and General Council* have actually *err'd*, unless *Contradictory Assertions* can both be *true*. Nay, all these four *Councils* I have mention'd with the *Popes* that *Headed* 'em, have agreed in rejecting this Conceit of this *Privilege of Supreme and Infallible Authority* being *divided* between 'em. All agree, it must be either in the *Pope* or in (what they call) a *General Council*.

And these miserable Confusions have of late driven many of their modern *Writers* to a *new Shift*, and a very desperate one, of placing this *Infallibility* neither in a *Pope* nor in a *General Council*, but in the *Diffusive Body* of those they call *Roman Catholics*. And this *Infallibility* they ground not on any *Supernatural Privilege*, but on the *certainty of Oral Tradition*, i. e. They wisely suppose, that the *Memory* of all their *Ancestors* in all *Ages* have been so far *Infallible*, and their *Honesty* and *Sincerity* so absolutely *Uncorrupted*, that they have handed down *all the Articles of Faith*, which

the *Romish Church* now holds, from *Father* to *Son*, without any *Mixture* or *Corruption* for these 1700 Years. But sure in this, we may appeal to common Sense, Whether ever there was a more wild and ridiculous Supposition, and more contrary to certain Matter of Fact? If *Oral Tradition* be so *infallible* a way of Conveyance, How was it possible for the *Nicene Creed* to prevail in *one Age*, and the *Arrian* to obtain so *Universally* in the *succeeding one*? How was it possible in the *Greek Church* for *one Council* to declare the *Worship of Images unlawful*, and *another* so soon to determine the *quite contrary*? How frequent were the *contradictory Decisions* of such pretended *General Councils*? And how plain a demonstration is every Instance of this kind against this pretended *infallible certainty* of *Oral Tradition*. And indeed the Pretence is as ridiculous, as if they shou'd tell us, That there is no need of our *Statute-Books*, because the *Memories* of our *Judges* and *Lawyers* will more *infallibly* convey the knowledge of our *Laws*, without any *alteration* or *corruption* to all *succeeding Ages*.

But there lies an untoward Objection against this pretended *infallible certainty* of *Oral Tradition*, that the *Eastern* and *Southern Churches* have the same pretensions to it, as the *Latin* or *Romish Church*. And consequently they have the same *Claim* to *Infallibility*. But if the *Romish Church* reject their *Claim*, and tell us, That *Oral Tradition* has fail'd among them (as it most certainly has, if ever all the *Articles* of the *Trent Creed* were the *Faith* of the *Universal Church*) Then this pretended *certainty* of *Oral Tradition* is overthrown; and we have the same reason to conclude, that *Oral Tradition* has fail'd among themselves.

We certainly know, That *Oral Tradition* did thus fail among the *Jews*, handing down *Errors* instead of *Truth*, and the meer *Precepts* of *Men* instead of the *Commands* of *God*. And yet they were the only *Visible Church*, and if the *certainty* of *Tradition* cou'd any where be rely'd on, it might among them. But since it so grossly mislead them, How much more may we presume it has done those of the *Church of Rome*, when we consider all the *New Articles* she has added to the *Ancient Creeds*, and the prodigious Difference between her *present* and her *Ancient Rituals*.

And after all, I wou'd only ask the Authors of this Opinion, Where is the *Tribunal* of this *Diffusive Church* *Catholick*?

Catholick? Where did they ever *meet* to declare their *Judgment*? How shall we make any *Appeal* to 'em in the *Controverted Articles of Religion*, or come to know their *Decisions* concerning 'em? Here I am afraid, We must be sent back to a *Pope* or a *Council* again, and must right or wrong take their *Decisions* for the *Judgment* of the *Catholick Church*. And so we are but just where we were before.

In a word, We see that after all this noise about an *Infallible Judge of Controversies*, and a *Living Oracle* in the Church, even those that pretend to it cannot to this Day agree, *Who it is*. They have the *Spirit of Infallibility* among 'em, but they cannot tell *in whom it resides*. Whom one Party sets up in this Sovereign Tribunal, another pulls down. So that we must leave themselves to agree first, *to whom* this *Infallibility* belongs; and it will be then time enough to hear the *Decisions* of this *Infallible Judge*, provided he first prove the Truth of so vast Pretensions.

I shall Conclude this Head; with a short Remark on Father *Nery's* admirable *Evasion* to Solve these perplexing Difficulties.

“ To illustrate this matter (saith he *) let us propose a * Modest and
 “ Familiar Example, if I should ask, Where the Lord- true Account
 “ Mayor of *London* is at this time; and some shou'd tell P. 67.
 “ me, he is in his own House: Others, not in his own
 “ House, but somewhere in *London*; and others, neither
 “ in his own House, nor in *London*, but in *England*; I wou'd
 “ willingly know, Whether these three sorts of People do
 “ not all agree that my Lord-Mayor is in *England*. Cer-
 “ tainly they do, because the Assent of the two former is
 “ necessarily implied in the latter.

“ In like manner, tho' some say, the *Pope* is *Infallible*;
 “ others, not the *Pope* alone, but together with a *General*
 “ *Council*, and others, neither *Pope* nor *Council* alone with-
 “ out the Concurrence of the Diffusive Body of Christians,
 “ yet all Concenter in this, that the Diffusive Body of
 “ Christians is *Infallible*. The Dr. then is very much
 “ out, when he saith, They know not where this *Infallibi-*
 “ ty is, tho' they are sure they have it.

I need do no more to shew the *Weakness* and *Absurdity* of this *Evasion*, then to tell the *Author*, That he has propos'd his *Example* wrong. For the Question shou'd have been, *Who is Lord-Mayor of London?* Now, what wou'd the *Author*

thority of a *Lord-Mayor* signify to end all Differences in the City, if one Party say, *John-a-Nokes* is *Lord-Mayor*, another, that *John-a-Stiles* is *Lord-Mayor*, and a third Party set up a third Person. Wou'd not any wise Man desire 'em to agree among themselves who is *Lord-Mayor* before they call on others to be *Subject* to his *Authority*? Wou'd their all agreeing that they have a *Lord-Mayor* among 'em, signify any thing to the ending those Controversies that are to be Decided by his *Authority*?

Or to bring the Matter nearer to the Dispute before us, let us suppose, that the City of *London* shou'd Claim such a *Sovereignty* in *Civil* and *Criminal* Causes, as some Cities in *Holland* and *Germany* enjoy. What wou'd this Claim signify, if they cou'd not agree, *Who* was Vested with this *Sovereignty*: If one Party plac'd it in the *Lord-Mayor* alone, another in the *Court of Aldermen*, another in the *Lord-Mayor* and *Court of Aldermen*, another in none of the former, but in the *Common-Council*. Wou'd their all Agreeing in the *General Claim* of such a *Sovereignty* signify any thing till they cou'd agree in *whom* it was vested? Wou'd the Notion of such a *Sovereign Tribunal* be of any use to decide Causes, till they cou'd agree, *Whom* to place in it?

The Case is the same here, The *Church of Rome* pretends to *Infallibility* among 'em. The *Pope* Claims it to himself. But his Claim is rejected by a great part of those of his own Communion. Those call'd *General Councils* claim it as their Priviledge. Their claim is rejected by most of the *Roman Bishops*, and by the Majority of those of that Communion. Some conjoyn 'em in that Priviledge. But their Opinion is rejected by all that place it in the *diffusive Body of Roman Catholics*. And this last Party found this vast Priviledge upon a quite different Bottom, viz. Not any *supernatural Gift*, But the *Certainty of Oral Tradition*. All do indeed agree, That they have *Infallibility* among 'em, But how can this Gentleman have the face to pretend, That they are agreed *In whom* to place it, When every one of these distinct Claims is rejected by so great a part of their own Communion? We may justly invert his Argument, If the *Pope* be not *Infallible*, A *Council* cannot make him so, If a *Council* be not *Infallible*, The *Pope's* concurrence cannot make 'em so. If the *diffusive Body of Roman Catholics* be not *infallible* in themselves, Their Concurrence with the Judgment of a fallible

fallible Pope and a fallible Council can never render their Decisions Infallible. So that their vain Pretensions to Infallibility are evidently destroy'd by themselves.

I now proceed

IV To shew, *That were there any such Infallible Tribunal in the Catholick Church, the Church of Rome wou'd have the least Pretention of any other to Engross it to themselves.*

The Truth is, If any such Priviledge as that of *Infallibility* belong'd to the *Universal Church*, It were most reasonable to place it in those they call *General Councils*. I say in those they call *General Councils*. For after all the Noise of 'em, There never yet was any such Thing as a truly *General Council* in the *Christian World*. The most *General* were those call'd by the *Roman Emperors* before the *Division of the Empire*. But 'tis evident that their *Mandates* did never reach to the *Extra-Imperial Churches*, who had therefore no Invitation to send their *Representatives* to 'em. And can any Man that knows how far Christianity had then spread thro' the habitable Earth, ever imagine that two hundred and fifty or three hundred Bishops were capable to make a true Representation of the Judgment of all *Christian Churches* *within* and *without* the bounds of the vast *Roman Empire*? Such a Number of Divines are few enough to give any tolerable Representation of the Judgment of all the *Christians in one large Kingdom*. How Unreasonable then is it that they shou'd pretend to do it for the *whole Christian World*? And how come they to pretend to represent the Judgment of the *Laity* that never deputed 'em for any such purpose? And truly none that impartially reads the management of Debates in the most celebrated of those *Councils* (as particularly the first *four Councils* that assume the Name of *General ones*) and observes the *Contentions* and *Heats*, the *Animosities* and *Passions*, the notorious *Ignorance* and *Unskilfulness* that appears in their so often mistaking *Nominal* Controversies for *Real Ones*, wou'd ever dream of any such thing as the Spirit of *Infallibility* residing among 'em, and directing all their Decisions.

But since the *Division of the Roman Empire*, and the separation of the *Greek and Latin Church*, There has been no such thing as look'd like a *General Council*. Nay in the present State of the *Universal Church*, 'tis impossible there shou'd be any such thing at all. A *Council* Compos'd of as many

many Divines as are capable of giving any true Representation of the Judgment of all the Christian Churches in *Europe* and *Asia*, *Africa* and *America*, cou'd not so much as be call'd and meet together without the Concurrent *Agreement* not only of all *Christian*, but of many *Infidel Princes* and *States* about the *Time* and *Place* of their Assembly. And can any Man in his Senses ever expect they shou'd ever come to such an *Agreement*? I shall start no Difficulties at present about the long *Voyages* and *Journeys* that the designed Members of this truly *Oecumenical Synod* must take, or how their great *Charges* shall be born. I shall only observe, That when they are met they wou'd be far too *numerous* to compose one *Assembly*; they wou'd not so much as understand any one *common Language* to manage their *Debates* in. And we might probably as soon expect regularity and concord in the *Builders of Babel* after the Confusion of Tongues, as hope for any *order* in their *Debates*, or *Harmony* in their *Judgments* as to the Matters in difference among themselves. So that a truly *General Council* is a meer *imaginary* thing, that never did yet exist, and the Attempt of calling one is evidently *impracticable*.

But for the late *Councils* which those of the *Romish Church* call *General ones*, they are no better then the *Gabals* of a corrupt and degenerate Sect, and the most of 'em notoriously Enslav'd by the *Roman Bishops*. I need only instance in the Celebrated Council of *Trent*, whose *Decisions* are the *present Standard* of the *Romish Faith*. An *Assembly* chiefly Compos'd of such *Italians* as were the *Pensioners* of the Court of *Rome*. And they were so far destitute of any true *Freedom of Debate*, that the Court of *Rome* at the first made themselves Masters of all their *Debates* by getting that *Clause* pass'd, *That nothing shou'd be Debated but what the Popes Legates propos'd*. A *Clause* that made the Council often loudly Complain of their being Enslav'd to the Court of *Rome*. But all in vain. For the Grievance was never Redress'd, nor the *Clause* revok'd till the Synod was breaking up, and there was no farther use of it. And no impartial Man can Read the History of their Proceedings (whether in *Father Paul* or in *Cardinal Pallovicini* himself) without clearly perceiving, that instead of the *Holy Spirit's* presiding among 'em, the *Court of Rome* did with a thousand *Artifices*, with all the exquisite turns of *Human Policy*, with *Bribes* and *Pensions*, with

Flattery and Menaces, turn and wind that Assembly at their own pleasure, form'd all their Decisions for 'em, and Eluded all Attempts that struck at the *Authority* of the Popes, and the notorious *corruptions* of their Courts, and baulk'd all the designs of such a Reformation as all *Europe* groan'd for. And after all, the *Pope* that Confirm'd their Decrees made himself yet more fully Master of 'em by reserving the *Interpretation* of 'em to his own Court. And yet this pack'd Convention (consisting chiefly of the *Pope's* Sworn Vassals) that had no other Inspiration then what came by the *Couriers* from *Rome*, all Christians thro' the World must take for *Infallible Judges* in matters of Religion. On *their Authority* we must believe, *That we ought to bow down to Images*, in opposition to the plain Language of the *Second Command*; *That the Laity are not oblig'd to Receive the Cup in the Lord's Supper*, tho' our *Saviour* has expressly said, *Drink ye all of it*. Upon their Authority, we must (in defiance both of Scripture and common Sense) take *Divine Service in an unknown Tongue to be most expedient for the Edification of the People*. Upon their Decision, we must digest all the Absurdities of *Transubstantiation*, and that stupid Contradiction of the *Romish* being the *Universal Church*. Upon *their Authority*, we must take all their most trifling Decisions to be necessary *Articles of Faith*, and all the *Christian World* that refuse to Subscribe 'em for *Damnable Hereticks*. And wou'd they persuade us that such a *Council cannot err*, when their *Errors* in these Decisions (and many more) are so *gross* and *notorious*. Nay, cou'd any Assembly of Men have fallen into such Palpable Errors, unless God had in just Judgment left 'em to a Spirit of Blindness, and given 'em up to *strong Delusions*? Methinks I cannot compare their Pretensions to *Infallibility* to any thing else, then to a Company of *Insected Persons* shut up in a *Pest-House* that shou'd confidently pretend all others to have the *Plague*, and themselves to be the only *sound Men*, when the *Plague-Sores* are all the while Visible upon 'em to every one's Eyes but their own. The Wise God seems to have permitted their running into such *uncommon and manifest Errors*, to render the Vanity of their proud Pretensions to *Infallibility* the more Conspicuous to the Christian World.

How comes then the *Church of Rome* that of all other Christian Churches, has made the most notorious Defection from the Simplicity and Purity of the Christian Religion, and whose Councils have of all others had the least shew of Liberty in their Decisions, to *Engross* this Privilege of *Infallibility* to themselves?

To make good this extravagant Claim, The forementioned *Author of the modest and true Account, &c.* undertakes to prove, *That the Congregation of the Faithful in Communion with the Bishop of Rome, and no other, is the Catholick Church.**

* p. 44. &c.

One would think that such a Proposition shou'd at first view appear to be in the highest Degree *Schismatical* and *Uncharitable*. 'Tis therefore worth our while to observe, How he goes about to prove it. To that purpose he lays down these four *Principles* as he calls 'em.

1. *That in the Catholick Church there is, and shall be a continued succession of Bishops, Preists, and Teachers from Christ to the End of the World.*
2. *That there is but one Catholick Church.*
3. *That one Communion as well as one Faith is essential to the Being of one Church.*
4. *That Whoever seperates from or is Excommunicated by the Church for the obstinate Denial of any Article of the Faith which the Church professes cannot be justly call'd a Member of the Church.*

For the *second Principle*: We shall let it pass.

Let us now see, How he proves and Applies the Rest to make good his uncharitable Conclusion.

For the *1st Principle*, He brings no other Proof of it, then the *IV Eph. 11, 12.* Where the Apostle tells us, *That Christ gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers.* Now all that this Text proves, is, That besides the *extraordinary Officers* employ'd for the first Plantation of the Christian Church, our Saviour design'd there shou'd be a Succession of those *ordinary ones of Pastors and Teachers* in it. So that if by *Bishops, Priests and Teachers*, he means the same as the Apostle does by *Pastors and Teachers*, it will be allow'd him, That our Saviour instituted the Office of such *Pastors and Teachers* for the perpetual use of his Church, if that be all he means by this *continued Succession*.

And now let us see, what he would hence infer. 'Tis in short, *That according to this Principle, the Lutheran and Calvinist*

Calvinist Churches are destitute of the least pretence to the Name of the Catholick Church.

Ans. If he mean, That they have *no pretence* to be the *Universal Church*, 'Tis *Granted*, they never were guilty of so *Monstrous* and *Senseless Uncharitableness* as those of the *Romish Church* in *Engrossing* the Name of the *Catholick Church* to themselves. But why may they not pretend to be a *Part* of it, and the *soundest* and most *uncorrupted Part* of it, among whom our common *Christianity* is restor'd to incomparably greater *Purity* then in the *Eastern Churches*, and much more then in the *Romish Church*? And what has this *Gentleman* to say against this *Pretence*?

To disprove this *Pretence*, he tells us, " They have
" neither lawful *Pastors*, nor lawful *Mission*, nor right
" *Ordination*, which cannot be given without the *Imposi-*
" *tion* of a *Bishop's Hands*; and consequently not the
" least pretence to the *Catholick Church*. To this pur-
pose he represents some learned *Divines* of the *Church of*
England as reasoning thus, " No *Man* can be call'd a
" *Christian* without being *Baptiz'd*; *Baptism* can only be
" conferr'd by such as have *Authority* to *Administer* the
" *Sacraments*; no *Man* can have this *Authority* but by
" lawful *Ordination*. And this cannot be conferr'd with-
" out *Imposition* of *Hands* by lawfully *Ordain'd Bishops*.
" *Bishops* these *Sects* own they have not; consequently nor
" true *Baptism* nor *Christianity*.

Ans. If by *Bishops* be meant the *Pastors* that have the
Overfight of *Christian Flocks* (such as the *Bishops* of the
Church of Ephesus mention'd *XX Acts* 28. Or those of
the *Church of Philippi*, *I Phil.* 1. Or those describ'd
I Tim. III. *I Tit.* 1.) All these *Churches* whom he
thus most uncharitably excludes from the *Catholick Church*,
have such *Bishops*; and among them the *Sacraments* are *Ad-*
ministr'd, and *Ordinations* are perform'd by the *Imposition*
of the *Hands* of such truly *Scriptural Bishops*. And so the
Foundation of this mighty *Demonstration* by which he
wou'd *Unchristian* all those excellent *Churches*, is no bet-
ter then a most *notorious Falshood*.

If by *Bishops* he means *Diocesan ones*, to make good his
Argument, he has these three things to prove, which he
is so wise as never once to attempt.

I. That this *Diocesan Episcopacy* is of *Divine Right* and
Institution. G For

For if the *Distinction* between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* as two different *Orders* and *Offices* be only owing to *Ecclesiastical Institution*, then the want of such Bishops can at most be no more then the Breach of an *Human Order*; and nothing can be more absurd, then to assert, That the Violation of such an *Human Order* does exclude those from the Church of Christ that *believe* all the *Essential Articles* of the Christian Faith, and sincerely *obey* the *Laws of Christ*. This is no less arrogant Presumption then to *equal* the *Canons of Men* with the *Laws of Christ*. Now this Author either dos, or shou'd understand, that the wisest and best of the Fathers never ascribe this difference of Order between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* to any other Original then *Human Institution*. And the generality of the *Papish School-men* maintain the same Opinion. Nor do the *Roman Popes* themselves own the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*. Nay farther,

II. He must prove also, That tho' *Diocesan Episcopacy* were of *Divine Right*, yet that the Observation of this point of Order that relates to the *Form of Church-Government* is *Essential* to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*.

i. e. He must prove, That the Gospel of our Saviour lays so great stress upon the *Authority* of *Diocesan Bishops*, (tho' it no where so much as expressly mentions 'em) that *Subjection to Christ himself* (by a sincere belief of his *Doctrine* and *Obedience* to his *Laws*) will entitle no *Man* to the Blessings of his *Everlasting Covenant* without a *Subjection to such Diocesan Bishops*. And if this be true, The Author wou'd do well to tell us, In what *Bible* he finds the tenor of such a Christian Covenant, for we cannot meet with it in ours. Perhaps he may find it in some *Oral Tradition* lodg'd in the Breasts of such as the Learned Mr. Dodwell.

Again he must farther prove,

III. That the *Line of Episcopal Succession* has been *uninterrupted* ever since the *Apostle's time*.

And if his own and all other Christians *Baptism*, and consequently their *Title to Christianity* must be call'd in Question till he has prov'd That his *Baptizer* was *Ordain'd by a Lawfully Ordain'd Bishop*, and that *Bishop* *Consecrated by a Lawfully Ordain'd Bishop*, and so on till he comes to the *Apostle's Age*: I am afraid he'll find it a difficult Task to prove, That there is a *Christian* or a *Church* in the *World*. And if he run to the *Line of the Romish Church*, I am sure, If the want of all the

the *Qualifications* which the Apostle requires in a *Christian Bishop*. If any kind of *Immoralities*, If *Simony*, or any other Crime he can easily name; can *incapacitate* a Man for the *Episcopal Office*, Their *Succession* has been of all others the most notoriously *interrupted*. And is not this admirable *Doctrine*, to make every Man's *right to Christianity* as doubtful as such an *uninterrupted Succession*? Is not this as ridiculous as if they shou'd tell us, That our Food will not nourish us unless dispens'd by such a particular Hand? Is not this making a *Mitre* and *Lawn-sleeves* and a *shaven Crown* as necessary to Salvation as *Repentance towards God and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*? And do not such wretched Principles as these give too fair an handle to those that thence take occasion to reproach our Common Christianity as meer *Priest-craft*? That such a poor Bigot as *Father Nery* shou'd espoule 'em is no great wonder; But that such Pretenders to Learning as *Mr. Dodwell* and others shou'd use such senseless Arguments as these to *unchurch* all the *Reformed Churches* is a great scandal and reproach to *Reformed Christianity*. But this Author is extremely in the wrong if he insinuate these to be the common Sentiments of the *Church of England*. And how well the *Papists* reward such degenerate Protestants as *Mr. Dodwell* and his *Followers* will appear in what follows.

His third Principle is, *That one Communion as well as one Faith is necessary to the Being of one Church*. (I suppose he means *One Catholick Church*).

Here our Author wou'd have done well to have explain'd what he means by *one Communion*. If he mean *Communion* in our *subjection* to one *supreme Head* of the Church our *Lord Jesus Christ*; in our *belief* of the same *Holy Scriptures*, nay of the same *Summaries* of the Christian Faith that were known to the three first Ages; in the *substance* of the same *Worship* which the Gospel institutes, and in *Charity* to all those that agree with us in the same *Essentials* of Christianity, so far there is *One Communion* in the Catholick Church. But then the *Lutheran* and *Calvinist Churches*, the *Church of England*, and all those *Eastern Churches* whom he wou'd Condemn, have all these Marks of that *One Communion*. But if by *One Communion* he mean, *Communion* in *subjection* to such a pretended *Vicarious Head* of the Catholick Church as the *Bishop of Rome*, or in all the *Unscriptural* (or even doubtful) *Articles* of Faith that are *superadded* to *Christianity*, or in all the *pompous Rites* that have been *superadded* to the plain

and *simple* Institutions of the Gospel; or in a word, in any thing beyond the *Essentials* of Christianity, we deny that any such *One External Communion* is necessary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. Nay, those do of all Men render *their Relation* to the *Catholick Church* most questionable, who make such *Communion* as this necessary to it, and who renounce all *Christian Charity* towards those that refuse to Communicate with 'em in these corrupt Additions to our common Christianity. Nay, if one *External Communion* be *Essential* to the *Being* of one *Catholick Church*, then in all those innumerable *Schisms* that have happen'd in the *Christian Church* (nay in the *Popish Church* it self) to the dividing their *External Communion*, the one or other of the *Contending Parties* have ceas'd to be a part of the *Catholick Church*. And does Father *Nery* think that upon the Authority of the *Author of the Cyprianick Age*, we will admit of a *Principle* that in every Age must *Unchurch* the far greatest part of the *Church Catholick*? What a load of Guilt must then lie upon those that necessitate this different *External Communion* by their *sinful* and *unwarrantable Impositions*? And how heavy does this Charge fall upon the *Romish Church*? For if this Principle be true, then the *culpable Authors* of such *Schisms* cut off their own *Relation* to the *Catholick Church*. And if those be the *culpable Authors* of *Schisms* in the *Christian Church*, who impose any *sinful Terms* of *Communion*, then the *Romish Church* that is of all others the most guilty of it is *no part* of the *Catholick Church*. So that these *pasti Excommunicating Darning Sentences*, like *overcharg'd Guns* do but recoil on those that wou'd level 'em against others.

His *Fourth Principle* is, That *whoever Separates from, or is Excommunicated by the Church for the obstinate denial of any Article of the Faith which the Church professes, cannot justly be call'd a Member of the Church*.

And in pursuance of this *Principle*, this *Author* excludes the *Greek* and all other *Eastern Churches* and the *Church of England* (whom he Brands both as *Heretical* for renouncing the *Doctrines* of the *Church of Rome*, and as *Schismatical* in her separation from that *Church*).

Ans. If by the *Church* he here means the *Universal Church*, there is no doubt but that he that separates from the *Universal Church* by renouncing any *Essentials* of the *Christian Faith*, and is *Excommunicated* on that account, can be *no Member of the Universal Church*. But

But what signifies this to the Case of all those Churches whom this Author so rashly and blindly excludes from the *Catholick Church*? For the *Greek Church* and the *Church of England*, I must desire him to tell us, What *Essential Article* of the *Christian Faith* they renounce that is receiv'd by the *Universal Church*? Do they not receive the *Holy Scriptures*, and all the *Summaries* of the *Christian Faith* that were known in the three first Centurys; nay, the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds* themselves? What then is this *Universal Church* which they *Separate* from, or are *Excommunicated* by? If he mean, they *Separate* from the *Church of Rome*, and are *Excommunicated* by her, is not this a notorious *Begging of the Question*, and taking for granted what he shou'd first have prov'd?

But if he mean whatever Doctrines have once very generally spread and prevail'd in the *Christian World*, tho' they are so far from being *Essential Articles* of the *Christian Religion*, that they are no better then *corrupt Additions* to it, that in this Case for any particular *Persons* or *Churches* to refuse to embrace those *corrupt Additions* when impos'd, and to adhere to *uncorrupted Christianity* in opposition to 'em, and to continue doing so tho' *Excommunicated* by the *Imposers*, is such a *Crime* as will exclude Men from the *Catholick Church*; If I say this be his *Meaning*, he cou'd not advance a more notoriously *false Proposition*. This is so far from being true, that if the *Majority* of the *Clergy* and *Laiety* in the *Christian Church*, shou'd agree never so fully in advancing any *New Articles* of Faith unknown to the *Holy Scriptures* (and much more if *contrary* to 'em) and shou'd presume to make the owning 'em *necessary Terms of Christian Communion*, and to *Excommunicate* all that will not herein concur with 'em, they are hereby guilty of the most hainous *Schism*. And tho' I will not say, that they hereby utterly cut off their own *Relation* to the *Catholick Church*, because they may retain the *Essentials* of *Christianity*, and may not discern the *Evil* and *Danger* of these *corrupt Additions*, yet they of all Men have the least pretence to *Engross* this Title of the *Catholick Church*, and render their own *Relation* to it far more doubtful and *questionable*, then *theirs* that adhere to *uncorrupted Christianity* in opposition to such rash and blind *Anathema's*. That the latter are a part of the *Catholick Church* is unquestionable; unless we will suppose, that our Blessed Lord will dis-

own

own Men for adhering to the Purity of his own Gospel, and for rejecting such Doctrines as bear no stamp of his Authority, or are contrary to his own Revelation. But for the former, no doubt our Blessed Lord will disown such corrupt Additions to his Gospel, and will regard the endeavours of Imposing 'em upon all the Christian World, and the Excommunicating of all that dissent from such Impositions as a pernicious and arrogant *Usurpation of his Authority*, who is the only *Master* of our Religion, and who alone can Claim a *Dominion over our Faith*. Such rash *Hereticators* and *Anathematizers* may indeed run a great hazard of *Damning themselves* by their insolent *Presumption* and gross *Uncharitableness*. But 'tis not in their power by such blind *Anathema's* to *Damn* all that reject their corrupt *Additions* to the *Ancient Creeds*.

And this is the real Case in reference to the *Romish Church*. She Excommunicates the *Church of England* and all other *Protestant Churches* for not Receiving all the Articles which the *Trent Creed* has added to the *Apostolical*. And on the same Account she Excommunicates the *Eastern Churches*. Now if all those Articles wherein she differs from 'em be meer *Additions* to our *Common Christianity*, and very corrupt ones too, The Rejection of 'em can never *Exclude* any of those Churches out of the *Catholick Church*. On the contrary, The *Imposing* 'em is a most unwarrantable *Usurpation*, and the true *Culpable Cause* of all the *Separation* that ensues. And to *separate from such Errors* is not a *Renouncing the Communion of the Catholick Church*, but a necessary means to restore the true and genuine *Terms of Catholick Communion*, which ought to be no other then the *Essentials of Christianity*. For 'tis in those alone we must ever expect to see any *Universal Agreement* among Christians. And till the *Reliques of Papal and Patriarchal Pride*, and the *Spirit of Imposition* be banish'd out of the *Catholick Church*, We must expect there will be a *multiplicity of External Communions* in it on the account of such *Impositions*, tho' there be but *One Communion* with respect to the *Essentials of the Christian Religion*. And those that place that *One Communion* in any thing more then the *Essentials of Christianity* do but under the *Name of Catholick Communion* give a deep wound to that necessary branch of it *Catholick Charity*; and by their blind attempts to *unchurch all others* go a great way towards *Unchurching themselves*. And as the *Romish*

Popish Church has above all others gone the farthest towards Renouncing *Catholick Charity* as well as *Corrupting the Christian Faith and Worship*, so she has rendred her own *Relation to the Catholick Church* the most doubtful of any other whatsoever. So that if the Priviledge of *Infallibility* did belong to the *Catholick Church*, She wou'd have the least Claim to any share of it.

I now proceed to the

Vth and last Head, viz. *That the Church of Rome's having made Use of this Pretension of Infallibility to justify all the Crueltys she exercises against those that dissent from her Decisions has thereby furnish'd us with a new and demonstrative Argument against the Infallibility she so confidently pretends to.*

That the *Romish Church* does account all *Popish Princes* oblig'd to *Exterminate* all those whom she condemns as *Hereticks* out of their *Dominions*, is manifest from the Determination of the fourth *Lateran Council* under *Innocent the third* that decrees the *Excommunication and Deposition* of all *Popish Princes* that neglect the doing it when 'tis in their power. A Council which the late *Author of the true and modest Account*, &c. tells us "has all the Marks and Characters that the most *Oecumenical Council* ever had, containing near 1200 *Prelates*." * This Do-
p. 127
ctrine is the only Ground that can justify the proceedings of the *Inquisition Tribunal*. And the *Roman Bishops* have acted consonantly to it in so often *Exciting Popish Princes* to *Exterminate Hereticks*, and in *Applauding* 'em for those *Massacres* and *Butcheries* of their own subjects, which have been acted by their authority, in order to the *Extirpation of Hereticks*.

And to this I may add, That Doctrine of the Council of *Constance* which has so great Affinity with it, viz. *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*.

Now let us a little Enquire, How consonant these *Doctrines* are to the *Gospel* of our *Blessed Saviour*.

For the former Doctrine, viz. That 'tis not only lawful, but the *Duty of Princes and Temporal Lords* to *Exterminate Hereticks out of their Dominions*, Even so great a *Duty* as that the continued *Neglect* of it deserves *Excommunication*, Let us compare it with our *Saviours* Declaration in a parallel Case. The *Samaritans* were both *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*. They were *Schismatics*, having forsaken the Temple at *Jerusalem* where God appointed all their *Publick Sacrifices* to

to be offer'd, and Erected a Temple on Mount Gerizim, in opposition to it. They were *Hereticks* and *Idolaters* that err'd in matters wherein their Salvation was concern'd. For our Saviour tells 'em, *Ye worship ye know not what, for Salvation is of the Jews.* IV John 22. And whereas the *Romish Church* exercises her Cruelty against pretended *Schismatics* and *Hereticks* chiefly for refusing to receive the pretended *Vicar of Christ*, These *Samaritans* refused to receive our *Blessed Lord himself*. (See IX Luke 53, 54.) And yet when the Disciples were upon that great provocation for calling to God to send Fire from Heaven to consume these *Schismatics* and *Hereticks* that refus'd to receive our *Blessed Saviour* himself, He was so far from approving their Zeal (tho they had the Example of *Elias*, to countenance it) that he sharply rebuked 'em, and told 'em, *They knew not what manner of Spirit they were of, For the Son of Man was not come to destroy the Lives of Men but to save 'em.* And sure He that wou'd not allow his Disciples to call for fire from Heaven wou'd much less allow 'em to kindle destructive flames on Earth to consume even *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* themselves. He that came not to destroy Men's Lives but to save 'em, will never approve their *Doctrine* and *Practice*, who think themselves oblig'd to sacrifice many thousands, nay millions of Lives by bloody *Massacres* and merciless *Inquisitions* to their flaming Zeal against what they call *Schism* and *Heresy*. (And O then how dreadful is the aggravation of their guilt herein beyond what words can express, if those sufferers whom they destroy under the Notion of *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* be the *real Members of Christ*, and the *sincere Professors of uncorrupted Christianity*!) All that our Saviour allows to be done towards those that refuse to hear the Church is to account 'em

* XVIII Mat. as *Heathens and Publicans* *) i. e. To exclude 'em from Christian Communion). And even here the Church that excludes 'em must take great Care that it be only for such offences and such *Impenitency* in 'em as by the tenour of the Gospel will exclude 'em from Heaven. Otherwise, they must not think, That the great God will be only the Church's *Lictor* to execute her *Excommunicating sentence* whether it be right or wrong. 'Tis only the Crimes of those obdurate sinners which they retain on Earth that shall be retain'd in Heaven. But to Exclude men from Christian Communion is a quite different thing from Cutting their Throats, or Roasting 'em alive.

alive. To treat *Infidels* and *Heathens* themselves at that rate wou'd be no better then *Murther* and *Cruelty*. And the *Apostles* themselves do herein tread exactly in our Saviour's Steps. All that St. Paul wou'd have done even to a *Self-condemned Heretick* after the first and second Admonition is to *Reject* or *Avoid* him. * (i. e. To shun his familiar Converse, to III Tit. 10. disown his pernicious Doctrine and Practice, and to disclaim any Communion with him therein). But this is a very different thing from *Embruing our hands in his Blood*, or *Condemning him to the Flames*. Nay, the same Apostle recommends to the *Servant of the Lord* a far different Carriage towards those that oppose his Doctrine, that he shou'd be patient, and in Meekness instruct such Gain-sayers, if peradventure God will give 'em Repentance to the acknowledgement of the Truth. 2 Tim. II. 24, 25. But 'tis hard to reconcile this Notion of Meekness and Patience to the new French way of Conversions by *Missionary Dragoons*, and their Brutal (or rather Infernal) Barbarities, or the Elder way of an *Inquisition-Tribunal*.

I wou'd not hereby insinuate as if all those call'd *Roman-Catholicks* did cordially approve such monstrous Cruelty; or that all *Popish* Princes do indeed think themselves oblig'd in Conscience to *Exterminate all Hereticks out of their Dominions* when 'tis in their Power. I believe in many of 'em our *Common Christianity* (not to say *Humanity* it self) gives 'em some abhorrence of such Barbarity. Nay our Adversaries themselves seem so far aham'd of it, that tho' in the late Persecution of the *French Churches* they actually put this Doctrine in practice, and their King was applauded for doing it by one of the best of their Popes *Innocent* the 11th, as if he had gain'd *Immortal Honour* thereby, * yet they did at the same time take all imaginable pains to persuade the World, that they us'd no other methods then those of Mildness and Persuasion to reduce the *Calvinistical Hereticks* into the Bosome of the *Catholick Church*. Insomuch as the *French King* in his infamous *Revocation* of the *Edict of Nantz* Publishes in the face of the World, That the generality of his Subjects of the pretended Reformed Religion had freely return'd to the *Catholick Church*. Nay those very *New-Converts* whom by all imaginable Torments they compell'd to renounce their Religion, were oblig'd to sign such a Form of *Abjuration* wherein they declar'd their *Renunciation* to be free

H

and

* Tis observable, that the French King & that Pope had violent Contests before, but as Herod and Pilate were made friends when Christ was to be put to death, so both these agreed in the destruction of the poor Protestants of France.

and voluntary. All this plainly shews, that they were ashamed of the Barbarous Methods which they really us'd, but were resolv'd to cover their *Unchristian* and *Inhuman Cruelty* by the most *abominable Falshood*; and to come up to both the *Characters* of him, that was a *Liar as well as Murderer from the beginning*.

But for all those of the *Romish Church* who truly detest such Cruelties as these towards those they call *Hereticks*, I wou'd desire 'em to make this obvious but just Reflection upon the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Romish Church*. If it be not *lawful* (and much less a *Duty*) for *Temporal Princes and Lords* to *Exterminate Hereticks*; if this be *false* and *pernicious Doctrine*, contrary to the Gospel of Christ, and highly reproachful to the Christian Name; then we have here one clear and convincing Argument more against the pretended *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*. For this is really the *Doctrine* of the *Romish Church* declar'd by one of her most numerous *General Councils*, and stands upon the same foot of *Authority* as *Transubstantiation* it self. And I need not tell the World, how Consonant their *Practice* has been to it for several Ages (where-ever they cou'd do it safely). Nay, their *Inquisition-Tribunal* is a standing Demonstration of their *Adherence* to it. And so is it their *Doctrine*, that *no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks*, if the *Council of Constance* be of any Authority with 'em (or that of *Trent*, which owns the *Council of Constance* for one of their *General-Councils*). Now if the *Roman-Catholicks* (as they affect to be call'd) own these *Doctrines* and think themselves oblig'd to act pursuant to 'em, then we know what we are to expect from 'em whenever we come under their Power, viz. That they think themselves bound in Conscience to *Exterminate and Destroy us whenever they are able*. And tho' they shou'd give us never so Solemn Assurances to the contrary (such as those of the *Edict of Nantz*) they are not oblig'd to keep their Faith with us, whenever they can safely break it. If they disown these two *Doctrines* (which are in themselves so odious and detestable, and such an indelible Scandal to our common Christianity) then the Dispute about their *Churches* pretended *Infallibility* is at an end. For those two Councils of *Lateran* and *Constance* were as much *General-Councils*, and their *Decrees* are as truly obligatory on all of the *Romish Communion* as the *Council of Trent* and their *Decisions*. Nay, if we may reckon the

the *Doctrine* of a *Pope* and *Council* the more *Infallible* for its being generally receiv'd by the *diffusive Body* of *Roman Catholics*, I know of none that has met with a more general Approbation if we may judge of their *Doctrine* by their *Practice*. And sure those must be abandon'd to strong Delusions indeed, that can take that *Church* for *Infallible* that has by her *Doctrine* so openly authoriz'd *Cruelty* and *Perfidiousness*, or the breach of the *Sixth* and *Ninth Commandments*. And the Truth is, when we view the *Romish Church* thundering out her rash *Anathemas* against all that Dissent from her most notorious *Corruptions* in *Doctrine* and *Worship* and *Practice*, nay from her most *frivolous* and *trifling Decisions*, and pronouncing 'em *incapable of Salvation*; when we behold her expressing as merciless *Cruelties* to Men's *Bodies*, as gross *Uncharitableness* to their *Souls*; when we see her raising *Crossadoes* to Massacre all that reject her Authority and Decrees, and setting up *Inquisition-Courts* to *Rack* and *Burn* pretended *Hereticks*; when we see her vastly out-doing the *Cruelties* of *Pagan Persecutions*, and drench'd with the Blood of several Millions of such Sufferers, and her Clergy applauding all these *inhuman Barbarities* as so many *laudable Acts* of *Catholick Zeal*, after all this, to believe this *Church Infallible* wou'd be as senseless a mistake, as to take *Savage Violence* for *Meekness*, *Barbarous Cruelty* for *Godlike Love*, and *Incarnate Fiends* for the *Vicars* of that Blessed *Jesus*, who was the *Merciful Saviour* of the *Bodies* as well as *Souls* of Men.

Having thus shewn the *Absurdity* and the *pernicious Consequences* of this Claim which the *Romish Church* lays to *Infallibility*, I shall close this Discourse with a few obvious *Reflections* thereon. And

I. If this *Claim* be *groundless* and *false*, then we may infer, what an unsufferable height of *Pride* those are guilty of, who unjustly arrogate this *Infallible Authority* to themselves.

And as none have been more forward in their *Claim* than the *Bishops of Rome*, so under pretence of it they have treated the *Blessed God* and his *sacred Word* with the utmost indignity and contempt. The *Lively Oracles of God* are in the *Church of Rome* but a *dead Letter*. But 'tis the *Living Oracle at Rome* that must give 'em their *Life* and *Sense*. Nay so cheap and low is the *Authority of God* speaking in his

Word, that this pretended Judge has declar'd *unwritten Traditions to be of equal Authority with the written Word*; (and of those *Traditions* to be sure he pretends to be the chief *Depository*). Nay he claims a Power of *Dispensing with all Laws Divine as well as Human*. And what can be a more genuine Character then this, of the *Man of Sin sitting in the Temple of God, and Exalting himself above all that is called God and Worshipped*? 2 Thess. II. 4. And how shall we reconcile these *arrogant Pretensions* with that *Child-like Humility* which our Blessed Saviour recommended to his *Disciples* (and to St. Peter as much as any of the rest) when he so severely rebuk'd 'em for that ambitious Dispute among themselves, *who shou'd be Greatest*? (see XVIII. Matt. 1, 2, 3, 4. compar'd with XX. 25, 26. &c.)

II. We may hence infer, Of how pernicious influence this *false Principle* is to *harden* those of the *Romish Church* in their most notorious *Errors and Corruptions*.

For while this *Principle* prevails among 'em *That this Priviledge of Infallibility belongs to the Catholick Church, and they are the Catholick Church*, they are hereby fenc'd against all means of Conviction by the *Charm* of this powerful Delusion.

For their *Popes and Prelates, and dignify'd Clergy*, we have a clear demonstration from the proceedings of the *Council of Trent*, how vain it is to expect from 'em any *Reformation* of those gross *Abuses and Corruptions in Discipline* which themselves *acknowledg'd and complain'd of*. For tho' all own'd the necessity of a *Reformation*, yet none cou'd agree where to begin it. The *Princes and Prelates* were willing to *Reform the Court of Rome* (the chief Spring of those grievous Disorders). But that *Court* found out the Artifice to set *them* by the Ears together, by putting the *Embassadors of Princes* on demanding a Retrenchment of the exorbitant Power of the *Prelates*, and putting the *Prelates* on demanding a Retrenchment of the Power of *Princes* in *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. So that after all *Europe* had been long waiting for a *Reformation*, they found themselves miserably disappointed. For excepting a few inconsiderable Regulations, the reforming the most scandalous *Abuses* was referr'd back to the *Court of Rome* it self, whose Interest it was to continue 'em.

And for the *Doctrine* of that *Church*, 'tis now so fix'd by the pretended Authority of that *Council*, that there is no hope

hope of their *Retraſſing* their moſt palpable and pernicious Errors without *Renouncing* this glorious pretence of *Infallibility*. And till the People's Eyes are open to ſee this grand *Cheat* and *Deuſion*, they are proof againſt all attempts for their Conviction. The miſerable Proſelites of that *Church* are entirely *Hood-wink'd*, or rather have voluntarily put out their own Eyes, to truſt the infallible Conduct of their Clergy. They have tamely abandon'd themſelves to *implicit Faith* and *blind Obedience*. They are (as 'tis ſaid of *Iſſa-char*) like an *Aſs couching under the Burthen* of all the *Impoſitions* that their Clergy lay upon 'em. And *partly* thro' contented Ignorance, *partly* thro' the dread of a rigorous Inquiſition, and *chiefly* thro' the ſuitableneſs of their Religion to the vitious propenſions of Human Nature by contriving an eaſy way to Savation, and *partly* alſo thro' the tremendous Judgment of God upon 'em for their *want of Love to Truth*, they are *given up to ſtrong Deuſions to believe a Lye*. They are among the *Blind*, that are *led by the Blind*. And till they come to diſcover this grand *Impoſture*, there is little hope of recovering 'em to the *acknowledgement of the Truth*.

III. We may hence ſee the abſolute neceſſity of *reſtoring the Holy Scriptures* to their *juſt Authority*, and the *Author* of 'em to his *Sovereign Empire* over the *Conſciences* of Men.

Our Adverſaries themſelves cannot deny the *Holy Scriptures* to be written by *Divine Inſpiration*. And for what other end can we ſuppoſe 'em to be written, but to make us *wiſe to Salvation*, and *thoroughly furniſh'd to every good Work*? And why ſhou'd we ſuppoſe 'em inſufficient to attain their end without the help of an *Infallible Human Judge*? Cannot the *Infinately Wiſe God* expreſs his Mind as plainly as Men? And what tho' thoſe ſacred Writings are liable to be *wreſted* by Men of perverſe minds? Are not the Writings of *Popes* and *Councils* liable to the ſame *Abuſe*? Have the Decisions of the *Council of Trent* put an end to all Controverſies among themſelves (ſuch as thoſe between the *Jefuits* and the *Janſeniſts*, the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans*, not to mention thoſe that relate to the *Seat of Infallibility* it ſelf)? Do not the Contending Parties each *Wiredraw* the Decisions of that *Council* to Countenance their own Doctrines? Nay, why ſhou'd we ſuppoſe, that God has provided any more *effectual Remedy* againſt the *Errors* than againſt the *Vices* of Men.

Men. For the *latter* are equally destructive of their Salvation. The Scriptures are as sufficiently *plain* in pointing out to us the necessary *Articles of our Faith* as the necessary *Rules of our Practice*. And we are as *inexcusable* if we *disbelieve* the former as we are in *violating* the latter. Nay, if there be a *necessity* of such an *Infallible Expositor* of the Bible, why has he not long since publish'd an *infallible Commentary* upon it, to *prevent* all *future* as well as *silence* all *present* Disputes about the Sense of it?

Let us then acknowledge no *Master* in Religion but the Blessed *Author* of it. Let us hear the great *God* speaking to us in his own *Living Oracles*. And we are sure, where those have free leave to *speak* the *false Oracle* at Rome will soon be *struck Dumb*. Where that *bright Lamp* shines, the *black Mists* of Papal Ignorance and Delusions will *vanish* and *disappear*. And of this the *Romish Bishops* and *Clergy* are so aware, that they have us'd all possible means to *wrest* the *Living Oracles* of God out of the *Peoples* hands, that they may more blindly receive their contrary *Decisions*. All that have liv'd in those *Popish Countries* where the *Inquisition* is kept up, know how rare a thing it is to meet with a *Bible* in the *Vulgar Tongue*. Nay in this Kingdom 'tis deplorable to think, in how few Families of those call'd *Roman Catholicks* the Word of God is ever read by 'em in a Language they understand. Every one must needs observe the visible *Design* and *Tendency* of all this to *raise* the *Authority* and *river* the *Domination* of the *Clergy*, and to confirm the *Laity* in a *blind Submission* of their Judgements to that of their *Priests*.

It shou'd therefore on the contrary highly recommend the *Reformed Religion* to us, That 'tis grounded on the *Holy Scriptures* the only solid Foundation of a truly *divine Faith*. We need no other *Lamp* to our feet or *Light* to our paths but the holy *Law of God*. We embrace no *Articles* as *necessary* to *Salvation* but what are *clearly reveal'd*. We own no other *Lord* over *God's heritage* but him that *bought* it with his own *precious Blood*? We yeild up our *Consciences* to the *Dictates* of no meer *Man*, but to his who is *unerring Truth* it self, and to whom this glorious Priviledge of *Infallibility* (strictly taken) dos alone belong. *Let God be true, But all Men Lyars.*

* III Rom. 4. * *They may deceive and be deceiv'd, but he cannot.* Let us bless him that has restored our *Consciences* to their true and manly

manly Liberty. We can (in consistency with our Principles) imitate the Example of the *Noble Bereans* in *searching the Holy Scriptures* daily, and bringing the *Doctrines* even of our *Teachers* themselves to that only *Unerring Standard* and *Test* of *Revealed Religion*. Let us then *stand fast in this Liberty wherewith our Blessed Saviour has made us free*. Let us receive no *Doctrines* in Religion but what carry the *Evidence* of *divine Revelation*, and no *Laws* as obligatory to the *Catholick Church* but what bear the stamp of his *Authority*, who is the only *Law-giver* to it.

And while we do this, we need not regard the proud *Anathema's* of those that arrogate an *Infallible Authority* to themselves. We need not fear their rash *damnatory sentence* according to whose *Principles*, the *Son of God* stands justly *Condemn'd* at the Bar of the *Jewish Sanedrim*. If their *Predecessors* call'd him a *Blasphemer*, 'tis no wonder that their *Successors* brand us for *Hereticks*. But both *they* and *we* must *stand* or *fall* by the *Doom* of an higher and truly *Infallible Judge*. All *Inferior Pastors* and *Flocks* must be accountable for their *Faith* and *Practice*, not to the *Romish Bishop* and his *Court*, but to our *B. Saviour*, the only *Universal Shepherd* and *Bishop of our Souls*. And 'tis not the *Decrees* of *Popes* and *Councils* but his *Gospel* that shall be the *Rule of final Judgment*. In the mean time, While they so rashly *exclude* us from the *Catholick Church*, and *pronounce us incapable of Salvation*, Let us *pitty* their deplorable *Ignorance*, and *Pray* for the deluded *Profelytes* of the *Romish Church*, that their *Eyes* may at length be opened to see how grossly their pretended *Infallible Teachers* have caus'd 'em to err.

And now *SIR* if this short Discourse may be of any use to dispose those of the *Romish Communion* to read your *Excellent Treatises* concerning these *Three Principal Heads of Doctrine* that are *Controverted* between them and us with a more *Impartial Attention*, I shall attain my *End* in the *Publication* of it. I heartily wish your *Judicious* and *Pious Endeavours* for their *Conviction* may be attended with great *Success*; I am with all *Sincere Respect*.

Reverend *SIR*,

Your very *Affectionate Friend*

and *Servant in our common Lord*,

J. B.



FIRST
DISCOURSE
Concerning
Transubstantiation.

FIRST
DISCOURSE



Publication.

A
T A B L E
O F T H E
C H A P T E R S.

C H A P. I.

Containing an Introduction to the following Discourse.

C H A P. II.

Containing the State of the Controversy.

C H A P. III.

Wherein the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is disprov'd from the Testimony of Sense.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is disprov'd from the Testimony of Reason, and the time wherein it is said to be effected and argu'd against.

C H A P. V.

Wherein the manner after which it is said to be effected is disprov'd.

C H A P. VI.

Containing such Consequences as follow the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

A Table, &c.

C H A P. VII:

Wherein the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is disprov'd from Scripture.

C H A P. VIII:

Wherein is prov'd that the Words of Consecration make not for Transubstantiation.

C H A P. IX.

Wherein the Arguments of the Roman Doctors to prove Transubstantiation are Answer'd.

C H A. P. X.

Wherein the Corporeal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament is disprov'd by Reason:

C H A P. XI.

Wherein the Corporeal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament is disprov'd by Scripture.

C H A P. XII.

Containing an Answer to such Scriptures as are insisted on to prove the Corporeal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament; the VI of St. John 52. Consider'd and Prov'd not to relate to the Sacrament.

C H A P. XIII.

Containing the manner of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, according to the Doctrine of the Church of England.

C H A P. XIV.

Containing an Historical Narrative of the Beginning and Progress of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

C H A P.

C H A P. I.

Containing an Introduction to the following Discourse.

T*ransubstantiation* has long been, and still continues the grand Subject of Debate in the *Christian Church*, and the chief Ground of *Seperation* and *Discord* between those of the *Reformed* and those of the *Roman Communion*. 'Tis in Defence of this among other *Doctrines* that the *Romish Church* has shed such *Torrents of Christian Blood*. And while this *Doctrine* is impos'd as a *Capital Article* of her *Faith*, and that *Adoration of the Host* in the *Mass* enjoyn'd which is the *Genuine* consequence thereof, all hope of *Reconciliation* is at an end.

This *Subject* then being of so vast Importance, tho' the *Volumes* written upon it are almost *Numberless*, yet I thought it worth my Pains to bring the strength of the *Arguments* offer'd on either side into this narrow *Compass*, that every impartial Reader may on this compendious but clear view of 'em be enabled to discern on which side the *Truth* lies. And if it appear upon the whole, That this *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* is as *repugnant* to the *Scriptures* as it is to *Reason* and *Sense*, that 'tis so far from subserving any valuable design of the *Christian Religion*, that it Saps the *Foundation* of it, and by it's numberless *Absurdities* and *Contradictions* proves a fatal *Scandal* and *Stumbling-block* to the *Infidel World*, beside the gross *Idolatry* it involves all its *Profelytes* in the *Guilt* of, by obliging 'em to pay *Divine Honours* to a *Consecrated Wafer*, we may reasonably hope that no pretended *Authority* of any Church whatsoever will be long able to support the *Credit* of it. On the other hand, if this *Pillar* of the *Romish Religion* (as distinguish'd from our *common Christianity*) be *overturn'd*, All the pretended *Infallible Authority* of the *Church of Rome* must of course *sink* with it. And indeed such is the peculiar *Absurdity* of this *Doctrine*, that by taking away the *certainty of Sense*, it is incapable of being *prov'd* either by *Divine* or *Human*.

Human Testimony, since without supposing the certainty of *Sense*, we can neither know that God has reveal'd any such Doctrine, nor that there is a Church in the World that ever believ'd it. So that we can have no *Evidence* of its Truth equal to that which all Mankind have of its notorious falsehood. So justly dos a Learned Divine represent this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* as the *Mill-stone about the Neck* of *Popery*, that (in spite of all its pretensions to *Infallibility*) will drown it at last.

CHAP. II.

Containing the State of the Controversy.

THE Word *Transubstantiation*, implies the *changing* or *turning* of one Substance into another, and the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* teaches Men to believe, That the Substance of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is so chang'd or turn'd into the Body and Blood of Christ, that there remains in the Sacrament no Bread or Wine, but only Christ's Body and Blood, under the whiteness, roundness, and breadth of the Consecrated Wafer, and under the colour and other accidents of the Consecrated Wine, which they call the Species or Forms of Bread and Wine.

There are three Opinions about the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, which I shall take notice of.

First, That of the Roman Church, which teaches, That there remains no Bread or Wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, nor any other substance, but the natural Body and Blood of Christ, which lies hid under the outward Accidents, Forms, or Species of Bread and Wine: This they call by the name of *Transubstantiation*.

A Second Opinion is of such, who deny any Change of the Bread or Wine in the Sacrament, and notwithstanding teach, That the natural Body and Blood of Christ is Corporally present in the Sacrament, and in like manner Eaten and Drunken by the Faithful that Communicate. This Opinion is call'd *Consubstantiation*.

Transubstantiation against Sense.

A *Third Opinion* is of such as affirm, the substance of *Bread and Wine* to remain in the *Sacrament*, and yet assert a real Presence of *Christ's Body and Blood* therein to the Faith of worthy Communicants, but deny a Corporeal or Carnal Presence thereof to be in the *Sacrament*, which is the Doctrine of the Church of England, and of all the Reformed Churches (the Lutheran excepted). For all these agree in owning the *Bread and Wine* to be only the *Body and Blood of Christ* in a figurative Sense, as they represent to us his *Body and Blood*, and convey to all worthy Communicants the precious Benefits and Fruits of his invaluable Sacrifice. Of which see more at large in the 13th Chapter.

I shall Consider these three Opinions in their order, and begin with the *First*, and in opposition thereto, I shall prove the following Proposition or Conclusion, *The Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are not chang'd or turn'd into the Body and Blood of Christ, but remain as true Bread and as true Wine after Consecration as they were before.*

This Conclusion I shall prove, First from *Sense*, Secondly from *Reason*, Thirdly from *Scripture*.

C H A P. III.

Wherein is prov'd from the Testimony of Sense, that the Substance of Bread and Wine remains in the Sacrament, and is not chang'd or turn'd into the Body and Blood of Christ.

I Begin with the *Testimony of Sense*. And one wou'd think the Controversy were brought to a short and easy Issue, when we can appeal to the Senses of all Mankind concerning the falsehood of the Opinion we oppose. And it seems a very odd Task that those of the Church of Rome put upon us, when they oblige us to prove that what appears to the Senses of all Mankind a small Wafer or a Cup of Wine is no such thing at all, but is really the *Flesh and Bones, the Body and Blood of a Living Man*, and has all the Essential Properties that belong thereto. For here is a full Concurrence of all that is requisite to the most certain Sensation, with respect to the Object, the soundness of the Organs of Sense, and the Medium of Sensation. If we can certainly know
Bread

Bread and Wine when we see it, when we feel it, when we taste it, when we smell it, if we can certainly distinguish this from the entire *Body and Blood* of a *Living Man* (with all the Essential Properties that belong thereto) then the *Controversy* is at an end. And if we cannot, then there is no certainty in our clearest Sensations; and 'tis impossible for us to know whether we converse with real *Corporeal Substances*, or *meer Shadows*.

I know 'tis here confidently pretended by those of the *Romish Church*, That their Doctrine does not suppose our Senses to be deceiv'd at all, and consequently does not destroy the certainty of Sense. Because (say they) " 'Tis not Substances that are the proper Objects of Sense, but only the " Accidents they are Cloath'd with. Now here are the " Accidents and Appearances of Bread and Wine, which " are all that our Senses can perceive or judge of. But for " all that, there may be no such Substance under those Accidents, nay, there may be another and that very different " Substance under those Appearances of Bread and Wine, " which tho' our Senses discern not, yet we must believe " to be there, if the Scriptures tell us so. To suppose " a Trans-accidentation indeed wou'd be contrary to the " evidence of Sense, but the Supposition of a Transubstantiation is no contradiction to our Senses. See *Modest and true Account*. p. 133.

Ans. The Question is not, as this Objection wou'd insinuate, whether *Corporeal Substances* as abstracted from what they call *Accidents* (such as Colour, Figure, Quantity, and such Qualities as Density or Tenuity, Hardness or Softness, &c.) be the immediate Objects of Sense? for that no one pretends to assert. But whether we cannot by such sensible Appearances or ~~Substances~~ ^{Accidents}, tell whether a Corporeal Substance be before us at all? And whether we cannot by those Accidents certainly distinguish one kind of Corporeal Substance from another? As for Instances, Whether we cannot by those Accidents or sensible Appearances certainly perceive, whether we converse with a *Man* or a *Shadow*, whether what we Eat be *Bread* or a *Stone*? Whether what we Drink be *Water* or *Wine*, *Wine* or *Human Blood*? Whether we grasp in our Hand a *Pound of Lead*, or a *Heap of Feathers*, a *Cannon-Ball*, or a *Bubble of Air*? For if we can by those Accidents or sensible Appearances, certainly perceive, that 'tis

a *Corporeal Substance* which we see and feel, and can certainly distinguish what kind of Substance it is, then the *Romish Cause* in this point is utterly lost. For we can then by the *sensible Appearances* certainly know that the *Bread* and *Wine* after Consecration are *Corporeal Substances*, and that what appears a thin *Wafer* is not the *Flesh* and *Bones*, and *Blood* of a *Living Man*.

But if we cannot by these *Accidents* and *Sensible Appearances* perceive, whether 'tis a *Corporeal Substance* that our Senses are Conversant with, nor what kind of Substance it is, then these monstrous *Absurdities* will unavoidably follow.

1. *There is no Credit due to Human Testimony.*

For no Man can be sure concerning any *Matters of Fact* that he pretends to be a *Witness* of. Shou'd I (as I imagine) catch a *Man* in the *Act* of Thievery, and take my *Money* in his Hands; I can neither know by my *Eyes* nor my *Feeling*, whether 'tis a *Man* or *Spectre* that I have got hold of? Or whether what I had lately in my *Pocket* and he seems to have in his *Hand*, be *Gold* or *Lead*? All that I can be sure of is only, that I have catch'd the appearance of a *Man* with the appearance of *Gold*, in what has the shape of an *Hand*, but I can never Swear that it was the Substance of *Gold* that I lost or a real *Man* that filch'd it from me. If I be a *Witness* in the Case of *Murder*, all I can Swear is, that the appearance of a *Man* with the appearance of a *Sword* stabb'd the appearance of another *Man*, and shed the appearance of *Blood*. But whether these were real *Men* or meer *Spectres* and *Apparitions* is more than I can with *Truth* and *Honesty* depose. The *Accidents* being the only *Objects* of *Sense*, I can Swear only to them. And if this be all the *Evidence* that the most unsuspected *Witness* can give, he must be a very credulous *Judge* that wou'd *Punish* or *Hang* any *Man* upon it. Nay, the very *Judge* and *Court* and *Spectators* are not certain, whether all about 'em be not meer *Spectres*? and whether the *Affairs* of *Judicature* are transacted in reality or only in appearance and shew? In a word, if only *Accidents* be the *Objects* of *Sense*, then we are at an utter loss whether we are all our Life long *Conversing* with *Substances* or meer *Phantom*s? Nay, whether what we call our own *Bodys* be not such *Phantom*s themselves? And sure the *Cause* of our *Adversaries* must be desperate indeed when it unavoidably runs 'em upon such *Senseless Absurdities* as these.

2. *On this Supposition, there is an end of all Divine Faith.*

For 'tis plain, that the *Revelation* which God has made of his Will to us must be receiv'd into our *Understandings* by the *Mediation* of our *Senses*. If any be inspir'd of God he must *Communicate* the *Message* to others by *Word* or *Writing*. And this must be transmitted to their *Understandings*, by their *Eyes* or their *Ears*. But now if our *Eyes* and *Ears*, and all our *Senses*, may in the plainest Cases (where there is no defect in the *Sense*, the *Object* and *Medium*) mistake meer *Accidents* and *Shadows* for *Corporeal Substances*, then they may as easily deceive us in what we think we hear or read of the *Words* or *Writings* of an *Inspired Person*. Nay, we cannot tell, whether the Person pretending to *Inspiration* were a *Man* or only a *Spectre*. Nay, if God shou'd *Confirm* such a *Revelation* by *Miracles*, we cou'd have no assurance that they were true *Miracles*, and not meer *Juggles* and *Impostures*, if our *Senses* can form no sure Judgment of *Corporeal Substances* by their *accidents* or *sensible Appearances*, but are liable in the plainest Cases to mistake the one for the other.

Nay, this *Doctrine* directly strikes at the *Foundation* of the *Christian Faith*. For in the *Christian Religion*, there are certain *sensible Matters of Fact* that must be assented to before its other *speculative Articles* can be receiv'd. We must believe, there was such a *Man* as *Jesus Christ* that *Conversed* with his *Disciples* and delivered his *Doctrine* to 'em; that he wrought manifold *Miracles* in *Confirmation* of it, that he *Died*, *Rose again*, and *Ascended to Heaven*. Now I here wou'd ask, What other *Assurance* had the *Apostles* themselves of all these *sensible Matters of Fact* but the *Testimony* of their *Senses*, that their *Eyes* saw, and *Ears* heard, and their *Hands* handled these things? (as one of 'em does elegantly express this certainty of their *Sensations*, 1 John 1 ch. iv). But if all that their *Senses* cou'd discern and perceive were only the *Accidents* or *Appearances* of *Corporeal Substances*, and those *Accidents* might appear where there was no such *Corporeal Substance* under 'em; then for any certainty that their *Senses* cou'd give 'em. It was not a real *Man* but only a *Spectre* and *Shadow* that they *Convers'd* so many Years with. Nor cou'd their *Senses* give 'em, any assurance that his *Miracles* were any other then *Delusions* and *Juggles*. Nay, on this *Supposition* of our *Adversaries*, it was but a
weak

weak and lame Argument that our *Blessed Saviour* us'd to satisfy his Disciples of the Truth of his *Resurrection*, when he thus Reasons with 'em, *Why do thoughts arise in your Hearts, behold my Hands and my Feet, that 'tis I myself, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as you see me have,* XXIV Luke, 38, 39. Nor is the *Argument* one whit the stronger that he uses to Convince *Unbelieving Thomas himself*, *Reach hither thy Finger and behold my Hands, and reach hither thy Hand and thrust it into my Side and be not Faithless but Believing.* XX John 27. For if *Sense* can perceive no more than the *Accidents* of a *Corporeal Substance*, then all that their *Eyes*, or even their *Hands* cou'd assure 'em was, that they saw the appearance of such a *Man*, and felt the appearance of his wounded *Hands* and *Side*, but whether there were any *Flesh* and *Bones* under those *Accidents*, whether it was a *real Body* or only a *Phantome* that was before 'em, their *Senses* cou'd no way assure 'em, *Substances* being no *Objects* of their *Perception*. Nay, shou'd our *Lord* have wrought any more *Miracles* to give 'em farther assurance of it, the same difficulty wou'd return, that their *Senses* cou'd never distinguish a *real Miracle* from a meer *juggling appearance* and *shew*. 'Tis said indeed, that upon our *Lord's Death*, *Many Bodies of Saints which slept arose.* 27 Matt. 52. But who can pretend to be sure of this memorable Event? had the *Disciple* that records this *seen* and *felt* 'em, how cou'd he know that it was *real Bodies* and not meer *Spectres* and *Shadows* that he Convers'd with; since tho' their *Senses* perceiv'd all the *Accidents* of *Living Human Bodies*, there might be really no such things. As they suppose that in the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist* tho' our *Senses* perceive all the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine*, yet there are no such *Corporeal Substances* as *real Bread* and *Wine* under 'em; but a *Substance* as different from 'em as an *Human Body* is from a small *Wafer*.

The truth is, that all *Revealed Religion* presupposes the certainty of the *Evidence of Sense* (not only concerning meer *Accidents* but the *Substances* cloath'd with 'em) as well as the common Principles of *Reason*. And if that certainty be taken away, we can have no *External Evidence* of the Truth of it. So that no *Religion* can have greater certainty of its Truth than we have that *Transubstantiation* is *False*. So unfit is that *monstrous Opinion* to be inserted into the *Articles* of any *Religion* that undermines the *Foundation* of all. And

so little is *Christianity* beholdling to those that wou'd load it with such an *Absurdity* as destroys the force of all the *Arguments* that shou'd convince an *Infidel* of the *Truth* of it.

Nay, *Transubstantiation* is so untoward a *Doctrine* as to destroy the force of all *Arguments* that can be alledg'd for the *Proof* of it self.

Do they go about to prove it from those Words in the Bible, *This is my Body*? How unreasonable a way of Arguing is this? 'Tis to prove, that our *Senses* are deceiv'd in the plainest Case (by mistaking sensible *Accidents* for a real *Substance*) by an *Argument* that has no force in it, unless our *Senses* can pass a certain *Judgment* concerning their proper *Objects*. For we cannot be so certain, that there are such Words in the Bible (and much less that they are to be taken in a literal not a *Figurative Sense*) as we are certain, that the *Bread* and *Wine* remain after Consecration, and that there is not the entire *Body* of a *Man* under those sensible *Appearances*.

Nay, shou'd they send us to the Decision of any pretended *General-Council*, or of the present *Roman Church*, the Case is the same. For no *Man* can give us clearer *Evidence* that such a *Council* or *Church* has defin'd such an *Article*, then we have already that the *Article* is false. We have but our *Eyes* or *Ears* to assure us of the one, but we have all our *Senses* to assure us of the falshood of *Transubstantiation*. So that those who assert it for a *Truth* must for ever despair of proving it. Nay, shou'd never so many *Miracles* be wrought to prove the *Truth* of *Transubstantiation*, this *Doctrine* wou'd invalidate the force of 'em. For if it be true, we cou'd have no certainty that those *Miracles* are any better then *Impostures* and *Juggles*. We shou'd have as little reason to believe 'em as we have to believe those *Miracles* which the *Priests* are suppos'd to work every time they say *Mass*. They do indeed confidently tell us, that there are such *Miracles* wrought every time the *Mass* is Celebrated. And indeed if their *Doctrine* be true, every *Romish Priest* works far more and greater *Miracles* then our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* all put together ever did. But the unhappiness is, that no *Man* is oblig'd to give any *Credit* to 'em. For we cannot imagine, that the infinitely wise *God* will ever require our *Believe* of invisible *Miracles*.

A *Miracle* is a *Sign*, and therefore must be a thing *sensible*; Christ wrought not any miracle but what was expos'd to the Examination of the senses of every Person present; When he turn'd the *water* at *Cana* in *Galilee* into *wine*, the *wine* did not retain the *Colour*, *Tast*, and *Smell* of the *Water*: He not only proves his miraeles by an Appeal to sense (*Go and shew John the things that You see and hear, the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised*) but commands the *Jews* not to beleive, if his *Miracles*, (upon examination) were not such as might justly require belief.

Nor do we Read of any *miracle* wrought by any of God's Servants, since the Creation, that the senses of sound men cou'd contradict, or were really otherwise then what they appeared to be. When *Moses's Rod* was turn'd into a *Serpent*; had it retain'd the *form* and *figure* of a *Rod*, it ought not to have been accounted a *Miracle*? nor wou'd God have been offended with *Pharaoh* for not being convinc'd thereby. And therefore it cannot be suppos'd that God shou'd require any man's Assent unto *imperceptible miracles*, or to believe any thing to be a *Miracle*, unless it can be *perceiv'd*, and upon Examination found to be really and truly so.

Nor do the *miracles* pretended to be wrought in changing the *Bread* and *Wine* into *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, answer the End for which one *miracle* was ever yet produc'd. The End of *Miracles* is to be a *Sensible proof*, or a *means* to convince us of what we do not see: Now how can that convince, that cannot be seen, but requires another *miracle* to prove it to be a *miracle*? How can that beget faith in the bearer, or spectator, that must require an *Antecedent faith*, to cause it to be believ'd? And therefore the *Miracles* pretended to be wrought, in turning the *Bread* and *Wine* into *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, having no other *Proof*, but a *Crede quod habes & habes*, and no other being but what the faith of the Communicant gives 'em, ought not to be impos'd on Mankind, being not only, not obvious to sense, but Contradictory to the senses of all sound Men, which upon the most diligent examination find it to be as true *Bread* and *Wine* after Consecration as it was before.

To this Argument from Sense, 'Tis farther Answer'd by the Romish Doctors " That 'tis evident from matter of fact, That our Senses may be deceiv'd in reference to Corporeal Substan-

ces,

ces, by the appearance of such sensible Accidents as do not belong to 'em. So were the Senses of St. John deceiv'd when he saw the Holy Ghost under the shape of a Dove, And so were the Senses of the Disciples deceiv'd, when they saw two Angels in the shape of Men.

Ans^r: That our Senses may mistake where all things requisite to Sensation do not concur, is a Truth that we can freely allow. And so Angels might so far assume the shape of Men as not to be clearly distinguishable from 'em when seen at some distance off and only judg'd of by the shape or colour they assum'd. So might the Holy Spirit appear in the Form of a Dove so as not to be distinguish'd by the Spectators at a distance from a real Dove. And in these Cases our Reason will tell us, That we must not rely on the Judgment of Sense, where several Circumstances are wanting that are necessary to the Certainty of our Sensations.

But this signifies nothing to prove, That our Senses ever are or may be deceiv'd where all things requisite to the Certainty of Sensation do concur. Had indeed the Angels that appear'd at the Resurrection to the Disciples presented themselves to 'em in the same manner as our risen Saviour himself did, so that they cou'd feel and handle 'em as they did his sacred Body; And yet what appear'd to their Touch and Feeling as well as sight to be human Bodies had prov'd only meer Phantoms and Spectres; Had St. John had that Form of a Dove which the Holy Spirit assum'd in his hands, and had it appear'd to his Touch and Feeling as real a Dove as any other, tho' there was no Dove at all under such an Appearance of one, Then indeed our Argument from the Certainty of Sense wou'd seem invalidated by this objection. But this we absolutely deny to have been the Case in the two Instances here before us. And therefore no Argument can be drawn from thence to overthrow the Certainty of our Sensations in reference to such sensible Objects as we have all possible Advantages to discern the true nature and kind of, and can pass a Judgment concerning upon the fullest Evidence that our Senses are capable of giving concerning any of their proper Objects whatsoever. And to suppose our Senses deceiv'd in that Case is to make the God of Truth himself the Author of the Deceit. Only by the way I would observe, That as to one of these Instances mention'd in the Objection, viz. of the Holy Spirit's descending

ding in the shape of a Dove, I take it to be a vulgar mistake. For tho' the Holy Spirit is said to descend in a Bodily shape like a Dove, 'Tis not meant that the Bodily shape he assum'd was that of a Dove, but that the Descent of it was like that of a Dove, that hovers over and overshadows what it descends upon. 'Tis more probable that he appear'd in the Form of Light or a bright Cloud whose trembling Motion was like the Hovering of a Dove. And this Interpretation is most suitable to the Original. For had the Holy Spirit assum'd the shape of a Dove, the Original shou'd have been *ὡς αἰὲν περιεπαῖς* and not *ὡς αἰὲν περιεπαῖν*. - But this I chiefly mention to shew, That this Text gives no Countenance to that scandalous Practice of the Romish Church in Picturing the Holy Spirit like a Dove. But as to the Argument it self I have no need of this Interpretation to take off the Force of it.

Some here are ready to argue; That the Body and Blood of Christ may as well appear under the Forms of Bread and Wine, as his Body cou'd penetrate the Doors of the House where his Disciples were assembled. XX John 19.

Ans^r. This Argument dos but support one Error by another. The Evangelist dos indeed assert, That the Doors being shut where the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, &c. But he by no means asserts, nor do his Expressions imply that our Lord's Body penetrated the Doors. Our Lord might for any thing that is there said have silently open'd the Doors, his Disciples not perceiving it, as the Angel open'd the Prison-doors when he let St. Peter out.

* And we have this solid reason to suppose That our Savi- XII Acts 9, 10.
our thus silently open'd the Doors, because if he had done otherwise, he had destroyed the force of all the sensible Arguments he us'd to convince his Disciples of the Truth of his own Resurrection. - It being as certain, That Flesh and Blood cannot penetrate thro' a Door, as 'tis certain That a Spirit hath not flesh and Bones. And the same Power that cou'd make such a Body of Flesh and Bones to penetrate thro' a door might make an Aereal Body or meer Spectre appear like Flesh and Bones to the Touch. So that unless we will suppose our Saviour to have done that which destroys the very Evidence he gave'em of the Truth of his own Resurrection, we must conclude this Argument to be founded on a false Supposition in Matter of Fact. See Dr. Whitby in Loc. in his Paraphrase on the New Testament. I

I shall only take notice of one Evasion more which the *Romish* Doctors use to take off the force of this Argument against Transubstantiation from the Evidence of Sense.

“ They tell us that Sense is to be accounted certain and infallible, unless where God reveals the contrary, which say they, he has in this matter done, Christ having expressly said, *This is my Body*.

Reply I. The certainty of Sense must be assented to, before we can have assurance of any thing that God has said, or the Apostles have Writ, or that Christ spoke those words (*This is my Body*) for all the knowledge that we can acquire thereof, must be deriv'd either from our Ears or Eyes. It's true Christ has said, *This is my Body*, but has no where said, let this Bread be turn'd into my Body, or that which you See, Smell, Handle and Taste in the Sacrament is not Bread.

We say it is Bread and Christ's Body too, and this we are taught from Scripture; but to believe it is not Bread which is in the Sacrament Eaten, is to believe that for which we have not only no Revelation, but to believe that which expressly contradicts the Revelation we have from God, (as shall be hereafter prov'd).

Reply II. For as much as God has therefore given Men their Senses, that by them they may be enabled to discern and judge of whatever is presented to 'em; it is impossible that God shou'd by any Revelation contradict the general Sense of the whole World. The supernatural Light we receive from God is an addition to our natural Light, but cannot contradict it, it may help and perfect it; but cannot destroy it.

Now shou'd God by any Revelation tell Men, that what they See, Smell, Taste and Handle in the Sacrament is not Bread; he shou'd by that Revelation contradict the Senses of Mankind: and consequently give to his Creatures contradictory Lights to guide 'em, which is impossible for God to do, because it is impossible for God to deceive the World.

Cannot Christ say, *This is my Body*, but all Men's Senses must be deceiv'd that take it for Bread? If Christ say, *I am a Door, I am a Vine*, must all Men's Senses be deceiv'd that take Christ for a Man?

i Cor. XI.
i Cor. X.

It cannot be deny'd, but that in several Scriptures the Bread in the Sacrament is call'd Bread after Consecration, and but

but once call'd *Christ's Body*; (and that when the *Living Body* of *Christ* sat at the Table) and this is all the Revelation that is pretended to prove *that all Men's Senses are deceiv'd*.

We desire no more but that these words (*This is my Body*) may be Interpreted, *This is a Sign or Pledge of my Body*, (the genuine Sense of the words as shall be hereafter prov'd) which Interpretation the *Roman Church* not totally acquiescing in, or contenting themselves with, are forc'd to reject the *Letter* of many plain Texts of Scripture, to assent to an innumerable Company of *invisible Miracles*, *infinite Absurdities*, *palpable Contradictions*; and in fine, to renounce their *Sense and Reason*. Our Blessed Lord (who never reason'd ill) argues from Sense to prove he was no Spirit; *handle me, see and feel, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have*: And surely he will not be offended with any Man for reasoning after his Example. Let the *Roman Church* Condemn me, to justify her *Infallibility*, certain I am *Christ* never will, for arguing as he hath taught me; *I see, I handle, I tast Bread* in the Sacrament, therefore *it remains Bread*, and is not *Transubstantiated into the Body of Christ*.

C H A P. IV.

No Change of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament into Christ's Body and Blood, prov'd by Reason.

HAVING prov'd from the Testimony of Sense, that there is no change of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament into *Christ's Body and Blood*, I shall now shew what Reasons are brought against this Doctrine.

The Arguments from Reason I shall reduce to three Heads. *First*, Such as disprove the Time wherein this change is said to be made. *Secondly*, The manner after which this change is said to be made. *Thirdly*, By shewing what consequences do attend this Doctrine.

I begin with the Time, concerning which the *Roman Church* teaches, that *Christ* did change or turn the Bread

L

into

into his Body, when he spake these words, *This is my Body*. The *Florentine Council* has thus determin'd it, and the *Roman Catechism* affirms the same, "We are taught by the Evangelists *Matthew* and *Luke* (saith the *Catechism*) that this is the *Form* of the Sacrament, (*Hoc est Corpus meum*).

That there cou'd be no change of the *Bread* into *Christ's Body* whilst these words were spoken, the following Reasons prove.

I. These words (*This is my Body*) are no operative words. Had *Christ* said, *This shall be my Body*, or let this be made my Body, there might be some probable ground to infer a change of the *Substance* after he had spoken 'em; but *Christ's* saying (*This is my Body*) can only suppose a change before he spake 'em, (and a *Relative change* we acknowledge to be made by his blessing the *Bread*) but to infer a change of the *Substance* made (by saying, *This is my Body*) is irrational. For if the *Bread* was not chang'd when *Christ* said, *Take, Eat*, then *Christ* bad his Disciples *Eat Bread*, and consequently call'd *Bread* his *Body*.

II. The *Priest* in Consecrating the *Bread* and *Wine*, repeats the words (*This is my Body*) only *Historically*. In the *Canon of the Mass*, after the Prayer, *That God wou'd make the Offering of his Son to be to us the Body and Blood of Christ*, it is immediately added (in imitation of the *Apostle's* recital of the Story) *who in the same Night he was betray'd, took Bread into his holy and venerable Hands, and lifting up his Eyes to Thee, his Father, God Almighty, he gave thanks, he blessed and brake, and gave to his Disciples, saying, take, eat, All of this, for this is my Body*.

The *Priest* here only repeats the Story, and shews what was done by our Lord in the first *Institution*, therefore the pronouncing these words (*this is my Body*) by the Mouth of the *Priest* can cause no change of the *Substance*, for if the *Substance* shou'd be chang'd thereby, it must be either of the substance of *Bread* into the *Priest's Body*, or of the *Priest's Body* into the substance of *Bread*; for if the *Priest* pronouncing the word (*Corpus*) be effectual to make a new *Body*, the pronouncing the word (*Meum*) must make it his *Body* who speaks the words.

If it be Answer'd, that the *Priest* in this action stands for *Christ*, and sustains his *Person*, and is to be look'd on not as a *Priest*, but as *Christ* himself in this action, and therefore

fore the Priest may say with truth (*This is my Body*), tho' in strictness of Speech it is *Christ's Body* and not *his*.

Reply, *Christ* took *Bread* and *blessed* it, and by *blessing* of it, *chang'd* it to a better use then it was first design'd for (for besides its *natural use* by *blessing* of it, he caus'd it to become the *Sacrament of his Passion*) and when he had *blessed* it, he *brake* it, and *gave* it to his *Disciples to Eat*, calling it *his Body*, (because the *Sacrament* thereof) and commanded his *Disciples to do as he had done*, that is, after a Solemn manner to take *Bread* and *bless* it, (whereby it ceases from *common use*, and becomes the *Sacrament of Christ's Body*) and after *blessing* it, to *break* it, and *give* it to the Faithful under the name of *his Body*, in remembrance of him.

But where has *Christ* told us, that the *Priest* in saying (*This is my Body*) represents *his Person*, and is to be look't on in this action not as a *Priest*, but as *Christ* himself? or where has *Christ* promis'd he will say, *This is my Body*, by the *Priest's Mouth*? We do acknowledge that the *Bread* stands for *Christ's Body*, and represents it in this action, (because *Christ* hath in Scripture call'd it *his Body*) and therefore we are to look on it not as *common Bread*, but the *Representative Body of Christ*; and can with truth say, it is *Christ's Body*, (tho' for *substance* it remain *Bread*). But for the *Priest's* standing in *Christ's* stead, and being lookt upon in this action not as a *Priest* but as *Christ* himself, there is no ground in Scripture, and therefore if there be a change of the *Substance* made when the *Priest* pronounces these words, *This is my Body*, this change must be either of the *Bread* into the *Priest's Body*, or of the *Priest's Body* into the *substance* of *Bread*.

And that these words, *This is my Body*, are only *Historically* related by the *Priest*, evidently appears from the words following concerning the *Cup* in the *Canon of the Mass*; wherein it is added *qui pro vobis effundetur, & pro multis in remissionem peccatorum, which shall be shed for you, and for many for the remission of Sins*; observe the Verb *effundetur* is put in the *Future Tense*, *shall* or *will be shed*, therefore if these words be otherwise understood then as *Historically* related, they must be an *untruth* because *Christ* can *Suffer no more*.

III. If by vertue of the words of *Consecration*, this *Change* is effected, there must be a *Change* of the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine* as well as of the *Substance*, 1. Because if a *Sub-*

stance be chang'd into another Substance, the Accidents cannot remain, unless they be common to both Substances; when Christ chang'd the Water at Cana into Wine, the Wine did not retain the Smell, Colour and Taste of the Water. 2. When Christ said *this is my Body*, the Accidents were contain'd under the word (*this*) as well as the Substance; wherefore he that thinks his Eyes may be credited, as to the Accidents; for all the words of our Saviour may as well think his Eyes, Hands, Nose, Pallate, and Reason may be credited, as to the Substance, notwithstanding our Saviours words.

Lastly, if while the words of Consecration are pronounc'd the Bread is chang'd, or turn'd into the Body of Christ; this change must happen either in the beginning, middle or end of the Sentence.

The Roman Doctors tell us, that the Bread is chang'd when the Priest pronounces the last Syllable in the sentence, and not before.

Hence arises a Question never to be determin'd, what Substance is contain'd under the Article (*Hoc* or *This*) in the beginning of the Sentence; it can't be Christ's Body, because the Change is not made, (say they) till the last syllable is pronounc't. And to affirm that by the Article (*hoc* or *this*) is to be understood *this Bread*, is to acknowledg that Christ called Bread his Body, which is to yield the cause. Here they are perplex't.

1. Because the Article (*this*) must necessarily relate to something certain, pointed out by Christ, which must necessarily be either Bread or his own Body.

2. Because in every proposition wherein there is an affirmation in the Nominative Case, there must be an Identity betwixt the Subject and Predicate, therefore in this proposition (*this is my Body*) or *hoc est corpus meum*, the pronoun *meum* must denote the same substance which the Article *Hoc* denotes, otherwise the Predication wou'd be most false.

C H A P. V.

The manner of the Change of the Bread and Wine into Christ's Body and Blood, Disprov'd.

THE *Doctors* of the *Roman Church* are irreconcilable as to the manner of this *Change*. Some will have the *Substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* chang'd into the *Substance* of *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, which is properly call'd *Transubstantiation*, against which opinion are given these following *Reasons*.

I. If the *substance* of *Bread* be turn'd into the *substance* of *Christ's Body*, then must the *Body* of *Christ* be made of *Bread*. When *Christ* turn'd *Water* into *Wine*, that *Wine* was made of *Water*; when *Moses's Rod* was turn'd into a *Serpent*, that *Serpent* was made of *Moses's Rod*; in like manner, if the *substance* of *Bread* be turn'd into the *substance* of *Christ's Body*, then must the *Body* of *Christ* be made of *Bread*; which is contrary to the *Analogy* of *Faith*, which saith, his *Body* was born of the *Virgin Mary*, being *Conceiv'd* in her *Womb* by the over shadowing of the *Holy Ghost*.

II. If the *substance* of *Bread* be chang'd into the *substance* of *Christ's Body*, then must both *Baker* and *Priest* concur to the making our *Saviour's Body*; the *Baker* in making the *Matter* whereof his *Body* is made, and the *Priest* in being the *Instrument* of producing this *Change*, or turning this *Bread* into *Christ's Body*, (upon which account they have much glory'd in former times, boasting themselves to be the *Makers* of their *Maker*.)

III. If the *substance* of *Bread* be chang'd into the *substance* of *Christ's Body*, then must *Christ* have *New-made Bodies* as often as the *Sacrament* is Administred, and consequently daily have a *new beginning*.

IV. If the *substance* of *Bread* be chang'd into the *substance* of *Christ's Body*, then must *Christ* in the first *Institution* of the *Sacrament* have produc'd himself, and consequently have been the *Person* producing and the *Person* produced, which implies a *Contradiction*; because whatever is produc'd must be

be *producible* before it is *produced*; that which is *producible* (consider'd as *producible*) can have no *actual Being*; the *Person producing* must *actually exist*: Therefore thou'd Christ have *produc'd his own Body*, he thou'd in the same instant have been the *Person producing*, and the *Person producible*, and consequently in the same instant have *existed* and *not existed*.

Upon the account of the aforesaid *Reasons*, the generality of the present *Doctors* of the *Roman Church* deny any *change* of the *substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *substance* of *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, affirming the *substance* of *Bread* and *Wine* to be by a *Miracle annihilated*, and the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ adduc'd*, or *made to exist* under the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine*.

Against this Opinion, I shall lay down these following *Reasons*.

I. There can be no *Transubstantiation* where there is no *change* of one *Substance* into another, the word *Transubstantiation* implies a *change* or turning of one *Substance* into another: And the *Council of Trent* has declar'd, that by the *Consecration* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, there is made a *Conversion* of their whole *Substance* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. And this *Declaration* agrees with the *Doctrines* of former *Popes* and *Councils*, and their *Canons*, which affirm the *Bread* to be *substantially Converted* into *Christ's Body*, which *Conversion* they Illustrate by *Christ's* turning *Water* into *Wine*, it having been also a most usual affirmation of their *Popes* and *Doctors*, that the *Priest* in this *Sacrament* *Creates* his *Creator*; which Reason *Pope Urban* gives, why the *Clergy* ought not to give *Homage* to the *Laity* for *Ecclesiastical Honours*, because their *Hands* were advanc'd to that *Honour* as to *Create God* by their *Ministry*. Wherefore such as affirm the *Bread* and *Wine* to be *annihilated* (as most of our present *Roman Doctors* do) must consequently deny their *Transubstantiation* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; for to affirm the *substance* of *Bread* to be *chang'd* into *Christ's Body* (which the *Transubstantiation* thereof must necessarily import) and to affirm the *substance* of *Bread* to be *annihilated*, is to affirm a *Contradiction*.

II. If the *substance* of *Bread* in the *Sacrament* be *annihilated*, then thou'd *God* *destroy* a *Creature* by *blessing* of it, which cannot be. *God* by *blessing* the *Creature* may *change* it to a *better use* than it was before design'd for, and so *Christ* did

did the Bread when he blest it, (for besides its natural use by being blest'd, it became the Sacrament of Christ's Body) but if the Bread be annihilated or become nothing, it cannot in any Sense be said to be blest'd or to become Christ's Body. Annihilation may be indeed a Curse, but can with no propriety of Speech be call'd a Blessing.

III. If the substance of Bread be annihilated, and the Body of Christ adduced or made to exist, where the Bread did before exist; then must the Body of Christ change place, and consequently leave Heaven. If it be where before it was not, it must either remove thither, or be generated and produced there, for a Body to acquire a new place without moving from the former place, or to come from Heaven to Earth, and not to leave Heaven, or be in the way betwixt Heaven and Earth is a gross Contradiction.

IV. If the Bread in the Sacrament be annihilated, and the Body of Christ adduced or made to exist, where the Bread did before exist, then must the Body of Christ sustain the Accidents of Bread, or those Accidents must subsist without a Subject, which whoever maintains must be able to Answer the following Queries.

I. What is it that is broken by the Priest in the Sacrament and Chew'd by the Teeth of the Communicants? That the Disciples of Christ in the first Institution of the Sacrament, (as also the Primitive Christians for many Hundred Years after) did chew the Sacrament and brake it with their Teeth, cannot be deny'd. Now it cannot be the Body of Christ that is thus chewed and broken, for that is impossible (and as the present Church of Rome teaches) without extension of parts, invisible and indivisible in the Sacrament, therefore that which is chew'd with the Teeth in the Sacrament, must either be Bread or an extended, coloured, figurate Nothing.

The Reader may by the way take notice, that about Six Hundred Years ago it was the Doctrine of the Roman Church, that the Body of Christ in the Sacrament was broken by the Hands of the Priest, and torn with the Teeth of the Faithful. This evidently appears from the Confession that Berengarius was forc'd to make.

Berengarius was accus'd for denying Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament. He liv'd in the time of Pope Nicholas the Second about Six Hundred Years ago, and was forced to make a Recantation in the following words,

Ego

Ego Berengarius, indignus Ecclesie Sancti Mauritij Andegaven-
sis Diaconus, Ecclesiam, cognoscens veram Catholicam Anathematizo
omnem heresim, præcipue eam de quâ hætenus infamatus sum, quæ
astruere conatur panem & vinum quæ in Altari ponuntur post
Consecrationem, solummodo Sacramentum, & non verum Corpus,
& sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse. Consentio Roma-
næ & Apostolicæ sedi, & ore & corde profiteor, de Sacramento
Dominicæ Passionis eam fidem tenere, quam Dominus & venera-
bilis Papa Nicolaus tenendam tradidit, viz. panem & vinum
quæ in altari ponuntur, post Consecrationem, non solummodo
Sacramentum, sed etiam verum Corpus & sanguinem Domini no-
stri Jesu Christi esse, & in veritate, manibus sacerdotum tracta-
ri, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri.

Reader, take notice, that in this *Recantation* Berengarius
is forc'd to Confess, that the Body of Christ is in truth handled
and broken by the Hands of the Priest; and torn with the teeth of
the Faithful, the Pope and Synod having declar'd it to be the
Faith [*quam tenendam tradidit*] which it deliver'd to be held and
believ'd: Which Doctrine is at present counted *Heresy* by the
Roman Church; who now maintain the Body of Christ in the
Sacrament has no extension of Parts, cannot be broken or chew-
ed, but remains Invisibly and Indivisibly under the forms of
Bread and Wine; and Anathematizes all that teach the con-
trary. Which evidently proves the Roman Church not to be
Infallible, but to have erred in this great point of their Faith
one way or other.

2. What is it that in the Sacrament nourishes our Bodys?
That our Bodys are not Corporeally nourisht with the Body of
Christ, is on all hands acknowledged; and both Reason and
Experience tell us, that our Bodys are Corporally nourisht
with what we Eat and Drink in the Sacrament; and History in-
forms us of some that have fed on no other Food for a con-
siderable space of time; nor cou'd any Priest starve while he
had a sufficient quantity of the Consecrated Host and Cup to
feed upon.

If it be Answer'd, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine, i.e.
the Colour, Quantity, Smell, &c. nourishes our Bodys.

Reply, That cannot be. 1. Because if there be no Bread
and Wine in the Sacrament there is nothing therein that can
Smell. The Body of Christ therein cannot, nor can a naked
Quantity; or an extended coloured figured Nothing smell, so that
if there is no Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, there is no-
thing

thing *Smells*, nothing *Nourishes*. 2dly. Whatever *Nourishes* must be converted into the *Substance* of our *Bodys*; and therefore must be a *Substance*. If our *Bodys* may be nourisht with *Accidents* they must consist of *Accidents*; *iisdem nutrimur ex quibus constamus*.

3. What is it that is *Corrupted* when the Sacrament happens to be so? It cannot be the *Body of Christ*, for that is *incorruptible*. It cannot be the *Accidents* of *Bread and Wine*, for a *White-red-extended* nothing cannot be *sowr* or *mouldy*, or *generate Worms*; nor is there any thing capable of *Corruption* (in a proper sense) but *Substances*. Q. 1.

The *Roman Doctors* are not yet agreed among themselves what *Answer* to give to this *Query*. Some say the *Body of Christ* *removes* when it comes into the *Throat*. Others say, it *descends into the Stomach*, and then *removes*. Others will have it *descend to the Bowels* (of which more hereafter). And some will have it *depart* as soon as it's *receiv'd into the Mouth*. But *what* that is which is *chew'd with the Teeth*, and *digested into the Stomach* and *converted into the substance* of our *Bodys*; what that is which is *sowr, mouldy, breeds Worms* (when the *Consecrated Host* and *Cup* are kept so long as to *corrupt*) is not yet resolv'd among 'em.

Some will have the *Bread and Wine* by a *Miracle* revert, either in the *Mouth* or in the *Stomach*, or in the *Throat*, or when it *begins to corrupt*. I leave 'em to their *Conjectures*, and proceed to shew what *Consequences* follow the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*.

CHAP. VI.

Shewing what Consequences follow the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

HAVING disprov'd the *Time* wherein, and *Manner* after which the *Bread and Wine* in the Sacrament are said to be *chang'd* or *turn'd* into the *Body and Blood* of *Christ*; I proceed in the *Third* place, to shew what absurd *Consequences* do attend this *Doctrine*.

Conf. I.

I. If the *Bread and Wine* (in Christ's first Instituting the Sacrament) had been *Transubstantiated* into the *Body and Blood* of Christ, then had Christ in his first Supper been *Invisible on the Table*, and *Visible at the Table*; the same natural Body must have been *seen* by his Disciples, and yet under an *Impossibility* of being *seen*, in the same instant he was *seen* by 'em, which is utterly inconsistent with the *Unity* of it.

Conf. II.

II. A *Second Consequence* of this Doctrine is, that the same natural Body of Christ at the same Table, in the same instant, shou'd have had all his proper *Organs* and *Dimensions*, *Head, Hands, Feet, &c.* and have existed *in a place*, and *after the manner of a Body*, and yet have been under an *impossibility* of *so existing*, in the same instant that he *did so exist*.

The *Roman Doctors* tell us, that its impossible for the Body of Christ in the Sacrament to have *extension of parts*, that its impossible it shou'd be therein capable of any *division*, or exist therein as *in a place*, or *after the manner of a Body*.

The Scripture tells us, that when Christ sat at the Table, and Instituted the Sacrament of his Supper; his Body had all its proper *Organs* and *Dimensions*, all its *Integral parts*; that it was an *extended Body*, and *existed as in a place*, and *after the manner of a Body*, and that Christ had but *one natural Body*.

The Consequence then must be, that the same natural Body of Christ on the Table before his Death, Resurrection and Ascension, shou'd have been under an impossibility to have had *Head, Hands and Feet, Eyes, Ears, Mouth*, and other *Integral parts* of a *Human Living Body*, to have *existed in a place after the manner* of a *Living Animate Body*; whereas at the Table, the same natural Body of Christ, at the same instant *did exist after the manner* of a *Living Animate Body*, and had all the *Organs* and *Dimensions*, *Integral* and *Essential Parts* thereto belonging.

Conf. III.

III. If in Christ's last Supper (or when he Instituted the Sacrament) the *Bread* had been *Transubstantiated* into his *Body*, and the *Wine* into his *Blood*, then must Christ's natural Body and Blood have been *separated* before he dy'd, and not only so, but his *Blood* must have been *separated from his Body*, and yet at the same instant *run in his Veins*. Christ's Body at the Table was a *Living Body*, his *Blood* running in his *Veins*,
if

if that *Substance* that was on the Table, which he gave his Disciples to Eat, cover'd with the accidents of Bread, was the same natural Body that sat at the Table; and that *Substance* that was in the Cup, cover'd with the accidents of Wine, was the same Blood that ran in his Veins; then must his Blood be separated from his Body, and yet in the same instant run in his Veins.

The Roman Doctors tell us, that *Christ's Body on the Table* Answer. was in his Blood in the Cup, and that his Blood in the Cup was in his Body on the Table, and consequently not separated.

Reply, Then it must follow, that the natural Body of Reply. Christ in the Cup shou'd exist under the accidents of Wine, and yet in the same instant on the Table, shou'd exist under the accidents of Bread; that is to say, exist under the accidents of Bread, and not exist under the accidents of Bread in the same instant; for the accidents of Wine are not the accidents of Bread. It must also follow, that the natural Body of Christ shou'd exist on the Table under the accidents of Bread, and in the same instant in the Cup exist under the accidents of Wine; which is to exist under the accidents of Wine, and not to exist under the accidents of Wine in the same instant, it must also hence follow, that in the first Institution of the Sacrament, Christ shou'd have Administred his Body and Blood twice to his Disciples; that he shou'd have given 'em his Blood when he gave 'em his Body; and afterwards have given 'em his Body when he gave him his Blood; that he shou'd have given 'em his Blood with his own Hands to Drink, and yet have had all his Blood running in his Veins at the same instant.

IV. If in Christ's last Supper, the Bread was Transubstantiated into Christ's natural Body, then must Christ's natural Body before his Crucifixion have been broken, and yet entire in the same instant. Christ deliver'd that which he call'd his Body to his Disciples to be Eaten, which was accordingly done, that is broken and chewed with their Teeth; the Body of Christ that sat at the Table was whole and entire. Christ had but one natural Body, if therefore that Substance which Christ gave his Disciples to Eat, and which he call'd his Body were his true natural Body; then must Christ have given his natural Body to his Disciples to be broken and divided, and yet in the same instant have kept his natural Body to himself whole and undivided.

Conf. IV.

Conf. V.

V. If in Christ's last Supper the *Bread* had been *Transubstantiated* into his *Body*, and the *Wine* into his *Blood*, then must it follow, that the *Disciples* shou'd have *Drunk* Christ's *natural Blood* before it was *shed on the Cross*; and *pierced* his *Flesh* with their *Teeth* before it was *pierced* by the *Roman Soldiers*; and consequently the *Jews* shou'd only have *Crucify'd* what the *Disciples* before had *Eaten*.

Conf. VI.

VI. If in Christ's last Supper the *Bread* had been *Transubstantiated* into his *Body* and *Blood*, then must it follow, that Christ in *taking the Sacrament into his Hands*, shou'd have *taken his own natural Body* in its whole *Substance*, and *held it in his Hands*; and not only so, but have put his *natural Body into his Mouth*; *Eaten* his whole *natural Body*. And consequently the *Sacrament* shou'd have *Eaten* Christ, as well as Christ the *Sacrament*.

To Conclude, waving other numberless *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*, in which the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* involves our *Lord's* first *Administration* of the *Sacrament* of his *Supper*.

Conf. VII.

Lastly. It follows, that the *Christian Religion* shou'd require its *Professors* to *Adore* what they *Eat*, and *Eat* the *Object* of their *Adoration*.

If the *Israelites* in making a *Symbol* of their *God* to go before 'em were guilty of a *heinous Crime*, what must that *Priest* be guilty of that makes his *God* in order to *Eat him*? If the *Eating of Men* expos'd the *Canibals* to the contempt of *Mankind*, no wonder if the *Eating their God* expose *Christians* to the contempt of *Mahometans*. It made *Averrões* with his *Soul* might rest among the *Philosophers*.

Dionys. Carthus. in 4 Dist. 12. Art.

He lived about the *Eleventh Century*, in which time the *Doctrine of the Oral Manducation of Christ's Body*, and *Guttural Drinking* of his *Blood* obtain'd a general *Belief*. He tells us, that he had *Travell'd* over the *World*, and had *Inquir'd* into all *Religions*; and found divers *Sects*, but none more *Foolish* than the *Christians*. "So sottish a *Sect* (saith he) I never found, as is the *Sect of the Christians*; because with their own *Teeth* they devour their *God* whom they *Worshipp'd*; for which reason (saith he) let my *Soul* abide with the *Philosophers*."

And its not to be doubted, if any such *Doctrine* had been taught by the *Primitive Christians*, but the *Heathen Philosophers* (who wrote against 'em) wou'd roundly have *Charg'd* 'em

'em with it. The *Christians* charge them in their Writings with many *cruel* and *bloody Rites* of their *Idolatry*, which most certainly they wou'd have *retorted* (and that with advantage) on the *Christians*, had there been any such *Doctrine* taught among them as was in *Averrões's* time. They wou'd have told them, that there was never a Rite in their Religion chargeable with *Cruelty* comparable to *theirs*, in *Feasting* on the *natural Flesh*, and on the *natural Blood* of their *God* and *Saviour*; nor did it lessen their *Cruelty*, that they did it under the *Species* of *Bread* and *Wine*, seeing they acknowledge the thing to be *truly done*. They wou'd questionless have *Censur'd* 'em as much as *Averrões* did.

Therefore the *Heathen Philosophers* not charging the *Christians* the first *Four Hundred Years* after *Christ*, in any of their Writings with any such *Practice*, is to a considering Man a plain demonstration, that there was during that time no such *Doctrine taught*, or *Practice used* in the *Church of God*, as the *Eating* and *Drinking* his *natural Flesh* and *Blood*: But that they understood the words of *Christ* (that has occasion'd all this ado) in their *Figurative Sense*, (which shall be shewn to be their genuine Sense in the following Discourse) and not in a Sense inconsistent with *Sense* and *Reason*, and the common *Principles of Christianity* as the *Roman Church* now understands 'em.

Upon the whole, can any thing be more *unreasonable* than to run into all these *Palpable Absurdities* and *Contradictions*, and thereby to expose the *Christian Religion* to the just *Scorn* and *Contempt* of the *Infidel World* (so far as they judge of *Christianity* by this Article of *Papery*) rather than to admit of such an obvious *Figurative Sense* of the words of Institution, as is every way suitable to the *nature* and *use* of a *Sacrament* or a *Fæderal Rite*? Wou'd not themselves deride or pity any one that shou'd be so *Senseless* as to put the like *literal Sense* on those Passages wherein our *Saviour* calls himself a *Vine*, or a *Door*, and to *Damn* all as *Hereticks*, that wou'd not run into the same height of *Distraction* with himself? But this leads me to the next Head of Arguments.

C H A P. VII.

Wherein is prov'd from Scripture, that there is no Change of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament into the Body and Blood of Christ.

HAVING prov'd from the Testimonies of *Sense* and *Reason*, that there is no *Transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ*; I proceed in the Third Place (according to my Method laid) to prove, that there is no ground from *Scripture* to warrant any such Change; but on the contrary expresse *Scripture*, proving, *That there remains Bread and Wine in the Sacrament after the Consecration thereof.*

The first passage of *Scripture* I shall insist on is *the words of Consecration*. Matth. 26. 26, 27, 28, 29. This *Scripture* is brought by our Adversaries of the *Roman Church*, as a main Pillar to support their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which I shall prove to Overthrow it, and Establish ours.

And as they were Eating (saith the Text) *Christ took Bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, Take, Eat, This is my Body, &c.*

From this *Scripture* I thus Argue: If Christ call'd Bread his Body, then must Bread remain after its Consecration, this Consequence is undeniable. *Bellarmino* acknowledges, that if Christ call'd Bread his Body, the expression must be *Figurative*; because that Proposition can't be true (saith he) wherein the former part designs Bread, and the latter part, Christ's natural Body (forasmuch as the Lord's natural Body and Bread are *res diversissima*, things most different).

The Controversy therefore betwixt Us and the *Roman Church* herein consists, whether Christ call'd Bread his Body, and Wine his Blood? They deny it, and we affirm it. I prove it thus.

That *Substance* which Christ gave his Disciples to Eat, he call'd his Body.

It was the *Substance of Bread* Christ gave his Disciples to Eat;

Therefore

Therefore

It was the Substance of Bread Christ call'd his Body.

I prove the Minor Proposition.

That *Substance* which Christ took into his Hands, blest and breakt, he gave his Disciples to Eat.

It was the *Substance* of Bread Christ took into his Hands, blest, and breakt. Therefore

It was the Substance of Bread Christ gave his Disciples to Eat.

That Christ gave the *same Substance* to his Disciples to Eat that he took in his Hands, blest, and breakt is evident from the Text; which saith he took Bread, and when he had blest it, he break it, and gave it to his Disciples. What did Christ give his Disciples? The Text tells you the *same Substance* that he breakt. He brake it and gave it. What *Substance* did Christ brake? The Text tells you the *same Substance* that he blest: He blest it and breakt it. What *Substance* did Christ blest? The Text tells you the *same Substance* he took in his Hands which was Bread: He took Bread (saith the Text) and blest it. Now Christ's calling that Substance his Body which he gave his Disciples to Eat, and giving 'em to Eat that Substance which he break, and breaking that Substance which he blest, and blessing that Substance he took into his Hands, and that Substance he took into his Hands being Bread; it undeniably follows, that Christ call'd Bread his Body. Here the Roman Church may shuffle and cut, and distinguish till their Hearts ake, but will never evade the force of this Scripture.

For Confirmation hereof, let us consider the words of the Institution concerning the Cup; wherein we Read, that Christ took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to 'em, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my Blood; in which words we are inform'd, that Christ gave to his Disciples the *same Substance* he took in his Hands, and that it was Wine he took in his Hands can't be deny'd, therefore it was Wine he gave.

2dly. If there were any change made of the *Substance*, it must be when Christ call'd it his Blood, and not before, which was after Christ had given 'em the Cup, and bade 'em all to Drink thereof, therefore it must continue Wine whilst Christ gave 'em the Cup, and bade 'em all to Drink thereof; and if it remain'd Wine whilst Christ gave 'em the Cup, and bade 'em all to Drink thereof, then it must necessarily follow, that

Christ

Christ bade 'em to *Drink Wine*. And if Christ call'd that his *Blood* which he bade 'em *all to Drink of*, it must necessarily follow, that Christ call'd *Wine* his *Blood*.

To this Scripture may be added Five Scriptures more, proving, that *Bread remains* in the Sacrament *after Consecration*, As oft as ye Eat this Bread, ye shew forth the Lord's Death till he come (saith St. Paul) and *whoever shall Eat this Bread unworthily shall be guilty, &c.* And let a Man examine himself and so let him Eat of this Bread. We here plainly see, that three times in one Chapter (where he purposely treats of the Sacrament) he calls it *Bread after Consecration*. And in his Tenth Chapter to the *Corinthians*, having call'd the *Wine* the Cup of Blessing (which it is not till after Consecration) adds, the Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? And again, we being many are one Bread and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread: Five times in these two Chapters St. Paul calls it *Bread after Consecration*. And having with so many Scriptures, the Evidence of *Sense* and *Reason* confirming it to be so, he that assents to the *Transubstantiation* thereof, must herein offer as great violence to the Scriptures as he dos to Reason and Sense.

Ans. I.

To these Scriptures two *Answers* are given. 1. The *Roman Doctors* tell us, that St. Paul call'd *Christ's Body Bread*, because it was once *Bread*. Thus we say, the *Blind see*, the *Lame walk*, the *Deaf hear*, &c.

Reply.

Reply. The common Opinion of the *Roman Doctors* is, that the *Bread* in the Sacrament is *annihilated*, and that *nothing thereof* becomes *any thing* of the *Body of Christ*: If therefore the *Body of Christ* never was *Bread*, nor *made of Bread*, this Reason must fall to the Ground.

Ans. II.

A Second Answer they here give, is, that St. Paul call'd the Sacrament *Bread* because it was *like Bread*. Thus the *Effigies* of things are call'd by the names of the *things* they resemble.

Reply.

Reply. Tho' it be Lawful in some cases, to call the *Effigies* or *Forms* of things by the names of the *things* they resemble; Yet in this Case it can't be Lawful. In a matter of this moment to have call'd *Christ's natural Body Bread*, had been utterly unlawful in the *Apostle*, who wou'd have laid thereby a most considerable *Stumbling-Block* before the Faith of Christians. Wherefore this Answer is a Charging the *Apostle* with great *Irreverence* and *Indiscretion*, if not with *Blasphemy*.

Blasphemy. Certainly that holy Apostle, had he believed the Sacrament to have been the *Natural Body* of Christ, he *would not*, he *durst not* have call'd it *Bread*.

Objection. If it be objected that *Bread* is a *noun* of the *Objection.* *masculine gender*, and the *Article* (*this*) is put in the *neuter gender*, and therefore can't denote *Bread*.

Answer. By the Rules of Grammar School-Boys, are taught, *Answer.* that in things *inanimate* or *without Life*, if the *Substantive* be not express, the *Relative* ought to be put in the *neuter gender*, because it being of *neither Sex*, the *Subject* is supply'd by (*Thing*) *This thing*, to say of Water *hec aqua est aqua* is much more Improper in way of Speech, then to say *hoc est aqua, this thing is Water*. But the reason why Christ put the *Article* in the *neuter gender* is, because it denoted not *common Bread*, but *Sacramental Bread*, or *Bread* ceasing from Common use, and becoming a Sacrament of Christ's Body. Moreover the *Article* (*This*) has relation to the whole action about the Bread, *viz.* the *blessing, breaking, giving*; and as much as to say, *This which I bless, break and give, this which I receive* at my hands and *Eat*, becomes the *Communion* or *Communication of my Body* (as *St. Paul* expounds it) and for these reasons the *pronoun* is more fitly put in the *neuter gender*.

C H A P. VIII.

Wherein the words of Consecration are further consider'd as urg'd by the Roman Church, in behalf of their Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

HAVING prov'd from *Sense, Reason* and *Scripture*, that there is no *Change* made of the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament, I come now to Consider such *Reasons* as are insisted on by the *Roman Church*, to prove their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. There are but *two Texts* of Scripture they chiefly build upon, the first is the words of Consecration (*This is my Body*) the second is, *Joh. 6. 53. Unless ye Eat the Flesh and Drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no*

N Life

Life in you. The last of these Texts seem only to prove the *Corporeal Presence* of Christ in the Sacrament, and therefore I shall omit the speaking to it until I have first laid down my *Reasons* to disprove it.

I shall at present only consider *the words of Consecration*, and such Inferences as they thence deduce.

Objection.

From the words of Consecration they Argue thus, "If the Sacrament be the natural Body of Christ, then must the Bread be chang'd; but that the Sacrament is the natural Body of Christ is evident (say they) from Matth. 26. 26. where Christ expressly calls it his Body. *This is my Body.*"

Answer.

Answer. I have already proved, that these words are so far from proving the *Romish Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, that they prove the clean *contrary*. And that forasmuch as Christ said of Bread, *This is my Body*, the Bread can't be chang'd but must necessarily remain; and consequently the expression must be Figurative, and the meaning, *This is a Sign or Pledge of my Body*. And this to be the genuine Sense and Meaning of the words; I prove by two *Reasons*.

Reason I.

I. Because in the *Hebrew Language*, or at least in a dialect thereof (*viz.* the *Syriack*) wherein Christ spoke those words, *This is my Body*, they import no more but this *signifies my Body*; the *Hebrews* and *Syrians* always joyning the names of the *Signs* with the *things signified*; and tho' in the *Greek Tongue* there is a proper word to express (*Signify*) by, yet the word (*is*) is most frequently us'd therein for the word (*Signify*). As the *Seed is the Word*, the *Field is the World*, the *Reapers are the Angels*, the *Harvest is the end of the World*: *Sarah and Agar are the two Testaments*, the *Stars are the Angels of the Churches*, the *Candlesticks are the Churches*, the *Rock is Christ*, *I am a Door*, *I am a Vine*, *I am the Way*, &c. in which, and in a multitude of more *Scriptures*, the words *am*, *is*, and *are*, are put for the word *signify*, it being the usual stile of both *Testaments* to call *things* by the names of what they *represent*, as in common Language we give to a *Picture* the Name of a Person it is drawn for.

Reason II.

II. Because Christ was Instituting a *Sacrament* when he said, *This is my Body*. Now a *Sacrament* consists of two Parts. 1. *An outward visible Sign*. 2. *An inward Grace or Benefit*. Now to give to the *outward Sign* the name of the thing signify'd is a *Metonymy* most usual in all *Sacraments* of the

the *Old and New Testament*. *Circumcision* is call'd *God's Covenant*, Gen. 17. 10. whereas it was only the *Sign or Seal* thereof. The *Pascal Lamb* is call'd the *Lord's Passover*, Exod. 12. 17. whereas it was only the *Sign or Memorial* thereof. *Baptism* Matt. 28. 17. is call'd *Regeneration*, said to *save us and wash away Sin*. Acts 22. 16. 1 Pet. 3. 21. Inasmuch as its the *Sign* of *Christ's Blood*, or of the renewing *Grace of the Holy Spirit*, which only is effectual in order to that end. St. Paul calls the *Cup* 1 Cor. 10. 16. the *Communion of Christ's Blood*, that is to say the *Liquor* therein contain'd, because it is a *sign* of our *Communion* or *participation* of the *Blood of Christ*. Hence it appears, that *Christ* in saying *This is my Body*, intended no more thereby, then *This is a Holy Sign or Figure of my Body*. And that this is *Christ's* meaning, evidently appears from those words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11. 25. The Apostle in the former Verses having told us, that *Christ took Bread, blest, brake and gave it to his Disciples*, saying, *Take, Eat, this is my Body*, tells us in the 25th v. that *after the same manner he took the Cup, and call'd it the New Testament in his Blood*, from hence arises this Argument, As the *Cup* is the *New Testament*, so is the *Bread Christ's Body*. The *Cup* is the *New Testament* only *Figuratively*, i. e. *Virtually*, or *Sacramentally*: Therefore The *Bread* is only *Virtually* and *Sacramentally* the *Body of Christ*.

In calling the *Cup* the *New Testament* there are two *Figures*. 1. The *Cup* is put for the *Wine* therein contain'd. 2. This *Wine* is call'd the *New Testament in Christ's Blood*, that is the *Sign of Christ's Blood*, whereby the *New Testament* was *Sealed and Confirm'd*. It can't here be deny'd but that the expression is *Figurative*; and the Apostle telling of us, that *after the same manner* that he call'd the *Cup* the *New Testament*, he call'd *what he gave his Disciple to Eat, His Body*, clearly proves that expression to be *Figurative* also; and the meaning to be, that the *Bread* he gave 'em to *Eat*, was the *Holy Sign or Figure of his Body*. And tho' I intend not here to insert any sayings of the *Fathers* to prove this, which is Copiously done by *Learned Protestant Writers* on this Subject, to whom I refer the Reader; yet that of St. *Austin* in his 23d Epistle to *Boniface* so clearly proving this exposition of the words I shall take notice of; his words are, *Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sunt Sacramenta non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent: Ex*

hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum nomina accipiunt: If Sacraments did not some manner of way resemble the things themselves, they shou'd not be Sacraments at all: And for this resemblance, they often bear the names of the things themselves.

CHAP. IX.

Containing an Answer to such Deductions from the Words of Consecration as are insisted on by the Roman Church.

BEfore I proceed to Answer such *Inferences* as are insisted on by the *Roman Doctors* from the words of Consecration, to prove their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: I shall desire the Reader to take notice, that there are two *Substances* receiv'd by the Faithful in the Sacrament, *viz.* the *Substance of Bread*, and the *Substance of Christ's Body*. The *Substance of the Bread* is receiv'd *Corporeally*, the *Substance of Christ's Body* really and truly, but only *Spiritually* and *Sacramentally*, as shall be hereafter explain'd. 2. Take notice, that not only in *Prophane Writings*, but also in *Holy Scripture* it is not unusual to *Ascribe*, not only the *Name* of the thing signify'd, but also the *Effects* thereof to the *outward Sign*; Thus *washing away of Sins*, *Regeneration* and *Salvation* are ascrib'd to *Baptism*, because its the *Holy Spirit's Sign* or *Instrument* in producing these *Effects*. Thus the word is said to *Sanctify us*, Joh. 14. 17. to *beget Faith*. Rom. 10. 17. to be *sharper then a two edged Sword*, piercing even to the dividing asunder of *Soul and Spirit*, of *Joints and Marrow*, &c. all which *Effects* do properly belong to the *Spirit*, but are ascribed to the *Word*, because its the *Spirit's ordinary Instrument* in producing these *Effects*. Even so to the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament is ascrib'd *Remission of Sins*, because they are *Signs of Christ's Body and Blood*, which are the *meritorious Causes* of the *Remission of our Sins*; and ordain'd as *Instruments* to *Confer*, and *Channels* to *Convey* the *Efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood* into our *Souls*, in order to that end. These things being premis'd, I shall lay down their *Objections*.

Object. I.

In the first place they argue, that the *same Body* that on the *Cross* was *given for us*, is in the Sacrament *given to us*, (*This is my Body which is given for you*) The *Natural Body* of *Christ* was

was on the Cross *Corporeally* given for us, therefore the *Natural Body* of Christ is in the Sacrament *Corporeally* given to us.

Answer. We acknowledge that the *same Natural Body* of Christ that on the Cross was given for us, is in the Sacrament given to us, but not given to us in the same manner that it was given for us on the Cross: On the Cross it was given *Corporeally* for us, in the Sacrament it is not given *Corporeally* to us, but only *Spiritually*, *Mystically* and *Sacramentally* (as shall be hereafter further explain'd) it is still the *same Body*, but given after a different manner.

2. They argue that the *same Substance* is given to us in the Sacrament that on the Cross was given for us, the *Substance of Bread* was not on the Cross given for us: therefore the *Substance of Bread* is not in the Sacrament given to us.

Answer. The *same Substance* that on the Cross was given for us is in the Sacrament given to us, I confess. The *same Substance only* I deny. There are *two Substances* given in the Sacrament, and but *one Substance* given on the Cross. There was given on the Cross only the *Substance of Christ's Body*, but there is in the Sacrament given not only the *Substance of Christ's Body*; but also the *Substance of Bread*: the former given *really* and *truly* but not *Corporeally*, the latter given *Corporeally* in the Sacrament.

3. The *same Substance* wherewith the *Soul* is *nourish't* is eaten in the Sacrament; the *Substance* wherewith the *Soul* is *nourish't* is not *Bread* but the *Body of Christ*: therefore it is not *Bread* but the *Body of Christ* that is eaten in the Sacrament.

Answer. The *same Substance* wherewith the *Soul* is *nourish't*, is eaten in the Sacrament, I confess. The *same Substance only*, I deny; there are eaten in the Sacrament *two Substances*, viz. the *Substance of Bread*, and *Substance of Christ's Body*; the *one Corporeally*, the *other Spiritually* and *Sacramentally*: The *Soul* is *nourish't* not with the *Substance of Bread* that is eaten *Corporeally*; but only with the *Substance of Christ's Body*, that is eaten *Spiritually* and *Mystically* in the Sacrament.

I retort this Argument thus; As our *Souls* and *Bodys* are *nourish't* with the *Body of Christ*, so do our *Bodys* eat the *Body of Christ* in the Sacrament: Our *Souls* and *Bodys* are not *Corporeally* but only *Spiritually* and *Mystically* *nourish't* with the *Body of Christ*; therefore our *Bodys* do not *Corporeally*

really eat the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, and consequently what therein is Corporeally eaten is Bread.

Object. IV

Matt. 26. 28.

4. They argue, That Substance that was shed for the Remission of our sins, is drunk in the Sacrament; it was not the Substance of Wine, but the Substance only of Christ's Blood, that was shed for the Remission of sins; Therefore it's not the Substance of Wine but the substance only of Christ's Blood that is drunk in the Sacrament.

Sol.

Answer. That substance that was shed for the remission of our sins, is drunk in the Sacrament, really, truly, spiritually and mystically, I Confess; Corporeally I deny: The substance of Wine was not shed for the Remission of our sins, I distinguish properly, or in a proper Sense, I confess, Sacramentally or in a Sacramental figurative Sense, I deny. The words of Christ are here to be understood figuratively; wherein he ascribes the effect of the thing signified, to the outward sign, viz. Remission of sins (the proper effect of his Blood) to Wine, as a Sign and Sacrament thereof; as is before explain'd, and therefore Wine, as it represents Christ's Blood, is call'd the Blood of Christ in the Text: and the Effect of Christ's Blood, viz. Remission of Sins thereto ascrib'd. And that it can't be understood of the natural Blood of Christ, has been already prov'd. Christ's natural Blood in a proper Sense, being not shed or pour'd out, before the Roman Soldiers pierced his Side on the Cross.

Some Interpret these words (*shed or pour'd forth*) in the future tense (and thus do's the Roman Church) using the words *effundetur, shall or will be pour'd forth or shed*; which Interpretation ends the Controversy; and makes their meaning easy: *This is my Blood that shall be shed or pour'd out*, that is, *This Wine is a sign of my Blood that shall shortly be shed or pour'd out on the Cross for the Remission of Sins*: And this Interpretation the words following Confirm, *But I say unto you, I will no more drink of this fruit of the Vine until, &c.* In which Scripture Christ calls that Wine which he and his Disciples had a little before drunk of; which clearly proves he meant not his natural Blood, but only Wine; the pouring out of which, represented the pouring out of his Blood on the Cross, for the remission of Sins shortly to ensue. It's very usual in Scripture, to speak of things that will certainly and shortly come to pass in the present tense; as if the thing were already done: And therefore Christ to assure his Church of his

his approaching Passion, uses the *Present Tense* ; *This is my Body which is given, and this is my Blood which is shed or pour'd forth*, that is, *this Bread* is the *Sign* of my *Body* that shall shortly be given, and this *Wine* is a *Sign* of my *Blood* that shall shortly be *pour'd forth* on the Cross for the Remission of Sin, as if he had said, I do now Ascertain you by what I do, that I will not shrink from Drinking the bitterest Dregs of that Cup my Father has provided for me ; and therefore I institute the *Memorial* of my Passion in the *Present Tense*. And if the words be otherwise understood, it must follow, that Christ shou'd have shed his natural Blood for the Remission of Sin before it was shed on the Cross ; and consequently had Redeem'd Mankind before he Suffer'd thereon, and consequently his Supper had not been the *Sacrament* of his Passion, but a real *exhibition* thereof : and forasmuch as there cou'd be but *one propitiatory Sacrifice* for Sin ; this had been made in the *Sacrament*, and his Sacrifice on the Cross either had *not been needful*, or shou'd have been made *only for Thanksgiving*.

The *Roman Church* acknowledges, that the *Sacrifice of the Altar* (as they call it) was Instituted by Christ, for a *Memorial* of that which he offer'd on the *Cross*. Now there can be no *Memorial* but of a thing that is *past* ; therefore the *natural Blood* of Christ cou'd not be *shed or pour'd* out in a proper Sense for the Remission of Sins, before it was pour'd out *on the Cross*. I am the longer in Answering this Objection, because on it the *Roman Church* place the whole strength of what they have to say against us in Proof of their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

V. They Argue, that if the *Bread and Wine* in the Sacrament be not *Transubstantiated* into the *Body and Blood* of Christ ; the words of Consecration can't be understood *literally*, and that they must be understood *literally* they thus prove,

Wills and Testaments, Covenants and Dogms of Faith, are (say they) always *plain and perspicuous* : Men use not *Tropes and Figures* in their *Testaments*. Christ spoke so as to be understood by his Disciples, which he cou'd not have been, had he spoken *Figuratively* when he said (*This is my Body*).

Answer. Tho' in the words a *Figure* be admitted, yet is it Sol. such a *Figure* as every Man endued with Sense and Reason may easily understand. The Apostles saw Christ *take Bread,*
blefs

blefs Bread, and break Bread, and give what he had broken to 'em; and therefore cou'd not doubt it was Bread he call'd his Body. Had Christ intended they shou'd have believ'd that the *Bread* ceas'd to exist, or was *Transubstantiated* into his Body, he wou'd have explain'd himself so as to be understood by 'em. For the Words of Consecration are not reconcilable with the *change of the Bread*, as has been already sufficiently prov'd. His Disciples must therefore have necessarily understood, that what Christ gave 'em to Eat and Drink was *Bread and Wine*, and also his *Body and Blood*: *Bread and Wine in Nature and Substance*, his *Body and Blood in Vertue and Representation*.

2. The Apostles knew the *Lord's Supper* was Instituted to be a *Sacrament*, and they cou'd not be ignorant, that the same manner of speaking was us'd in all *Sacraments*, that is, giving the name of *the thing signify'd* to the *Sign*; they knew this to have been always us'd in the *Jewish Church* in the Celebration of the *Passover*, which manner of speaking, they cou'd not but know our Saviour imitated at that time. Nay, what is a *Sacrament* but a *Mystery*, therefore the *Lord's Supper* being a *Mystery*, may well admit of a *Mystical Expression*: And that it dos so, is evident from the words concerning the Cup, *This Cup is the New Testament*; where the *Cup* is put for the *Liquor* therein contain'd, and this is call'd the *New Testament*, because it is a confirming Sign thereof.

Wherefore to affirm that *Testaments, Pacts, and Dogms of Faith*, must exclude all *Tropes and Figurés* is a groundleis Affirmation. We find in human *Testaments* all things are not plain, hence are occasion'd many Suits in Law. But in *Spiritual and Divine Testaments*, the reason is not the same, because in human *Testaments*, there is nothing but *Legacys and express Commands*; but in *Divine Testaments* there are *Mysteries* to exercise Faith, Industry and other Graces. In human *Testaments* Men ought to speak plain, because they can speak no more being Dead. But Christ tho' he Died, yet now *Liveth*, and still *speaks*, yea, sendeth his Spirit to enable his Church to understand as much as he pleaseth of his Mind and Will; and as much as is necessary for their Salvation.

Moreover, what is *Jacob's Testament* but a heap of *Allegories*. The same I may of that of *Moses*. And is not Christ's

Session at the Right Hand of God an Article of Faith, yet *Figuratively* to be understood? Wherefore to affirm, that there can be no *Figure* in the words of *Consecration*, because *Dogms of Faith, Covenants and Testaments* ought to be plain, is to talk at random.

Lastly, They Argue that if the *Matter* of the Sacrament be *Bread and Wine*, then must the *Figures and Types* thereof be more excellent then the *Sacramental Elements*. The *Paschal Lamb* was more excellent then *common Bread*, and wou'd more significantly have represented a *Crucify'd Christ*: Christ therefore wou'd never have chang'd a *Lamb* for a *bit of Bread*, had he not intended the *Transubstantiation* thereof into his *Body*. To substitute a little *Baker's Bread*, and *Drink* a little *Wine* now and then in *remembrance of Christ*, is an *insignificant Ceremony*; and the same in effect, as if a Friend were to Travel into a far Country, and shou'd appoint his Friends now and then to *Eat a little Bread*, and *Drink a little Wine* in remembrance of him till his return.

Answer. The Elements of *Bread and Wine* excel the *matter* of all Sacraments that are or have been; forasmuch as after *Consecration* they cease to be *common Bread and Wine*, and become the *Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood*, as also *Channels* to convey *Grace*, and *Instruments* to confer Christ himself, as shall be hereafter shewn.

But why did not Christ make choise of more rich and gaudy Elements to represent his *Body and Blood*. Query.

Answ. 1. Because he thought 'em not becoming the simplicity of the Gospel, and meanness of his present State.

2. To teach his Church not to value the *Creature* for its excellency, but only for the *Image* that he hath stamp't thereon. A *King's Image* on a piece of *Leather* makes it more Current then a piece of *Gold* without it.

3. The Elements of *Bread and Wine* are a more lively *Representative* of Christ *Crucify'd* (as given to the Faithful in the *Lord's Supper*) then many are aware of. 1. Because of the many Alterations that *Corn* passes thro', as *Threshing, Grinding, Baking, Breaking, Chewing* before it become fit to Nourish. The *Bruising* and *Pressing* of the *Grape* before it become *Wine* to Drink; all which, excellently sets forth the many Alterations Christ's Body was to undergo before it cou'd be a *Sacrifice* for our Sins, and *Nutrimment* for our Souls.

2. As *Bread* is the *Staff* and *Life* of Man, without which (tho' there be a Confluence of other Blessings) a Famine do's ensue, even so is Christ the *Staff* and *Life* of our Souls: And what can more excellently represent him than *Bread*, a Creature wherein our Bodily Life consists.

The same I may say of *Wine*, a Creature given for Man's *Comfort* and *Refreshment*, and therefore most fit to represent Christ's most precious *Blood*.

In *Bread* we have represented the necessity of a Christ; in *Wine*, the comfort and delight the believing Soul receives in him: and in both, the *Fulness* and *Allsufficiency* of a Crucify'd Christ, that in him are all things for necessity and delight.

The *Constantinopolitan Fathers* tell us, that Christ made choice of *Bread*, that no occasion might be given for bringing in *Idolatry*.

Tom. 3.
Art. 6.
2 Conc. Nic.

That *Council* consisting of three Hundred and thirty Eight Bishops, maintain'd, that Christ chose no other shape under Heaven to represent his *Incarnation* but the *Sacrament*.

Concerning the *Sacrament* they affirm, that Christ deliver'd it to his Ministers for a *Type* and *effectual Commemoration* of himself, commanding the *substance* of *Bread* to be offer'd which did not any way resemble the *Form* of a Man, that no occasion might be given to *Idolatry*.

I have now finish'd my Answers to such reasons as are insisted on by the *Roman Church*, to prove their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. What is further urg'd by 'em on this point, relates to the *Corporeal Presence* of Christ in the *Sacrament*, which I shall first *disprove*, and then *Answer* what they offer in its *Justification*.

CHAP. X.

Wherein are contain'd Reasons disproving Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament.

HAVING thus disprov'd the first of these Opinions that relate to this Sacrament, viz. that of those who affirm the *Bread* and *Wine* to be chang'd into the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, which change they call *Transubstantiation*.

I now proceed to Consider,

A second Opinion, viz. of such as deny any change of the Bread and Wine, and yet Affirm the Body and Blood of Christ, to be Corporeally Present in and with the substance of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament. And this Opinion is call'd Consubstantiation.

In opposition thereto I lay down this Conclusion.

The natural Body and Blood of Christ are not Corporeally or Carnally Present in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

This Conclusion I shall endeavour to prove from Reason and Scripture, and Answer what is said in Proof of Christ's Corporeal presence in the Sacrament.

My first Argument from Reason is taken from the nature Argument. of a Body, which can't otherwise exist then as a Body; that is to say, in a Place. To affirm, that the natural Body of Christ is Corporeally present in the Sacrament Invisibly and Indivisibly, is to affirm, that his natural Body is Corporeally there present after the manner of a Spirit. Now what is present any where after the manner of a Spirit is Incorporeally present. Therefore if the Body of Christ be not in the Sacrament present after the manner of a Body, but only Invisibly and Indivisibly after the manner of a Spirit, he must be Incorporeally present. And if any Man has such a sharpness of Wit, as to apprehend how a Body can be Corporeally present any where, and yet in the same instant Incorporeally present there, I shall not envy him.

I do acknowledge that God is infinite in Power, and therefore can turn a Body into a Spirit. But to be a natural Body and a Spirit in the same instant; to be a Body and yet Invisible and Indivisible, to be Corporeally present, and yet not to exist as in a Place, to be Bodily present, and yet not to be present after the manner of a Body is to be Bodily present, and not Bodily; Corporeally present, and Incorporeally; a Body and a Spirit in the same instant; which is a contradiction too gross for my understanding to digest. But suppose the Body of Christ shou'd be present in the Sacrament invisibly and indivisibly, or after the manner of a Spirit, and not of a Body, (according to the present Roman Doctrine) I ask how can his Body thus present in the Sacrament be Eaten? Christ has commanded us to Eat his Body, now what is Eaten must be chewed with the Teeth (or with our Gums if we have no Teeth) which Christ's Disciples certainly did in the first

Institution; when Christ deliver'd 'em the Sacrament. If the Body of Christ be *Indivisible* in the Sacrament, or exist therein *after the manner of a Spirit* without extension of Parts it can't possibly be *Eaten*.

If it be *Answer'd*, that *swallowing* will serve the turn, we Reply, Christ commanded *Eating*. I say, he commanded us to *Eat* the Sacrament, and not to *swallow* it. *Swallowing* and *Eating* are distinct Actions, and admit of contradictory Prædicates, a Man may *swallow* many things and yet be *Fasting*, but cannot *Eat* any thing and yet be *Fasting* too. The Whale *swallow'd* *Jonah* but did not *Eat* him; and no Man will say, he *Eats* *Phisick* or *Medicinal Pills* when he *swallows* 'em. There are also many things as *Stones*, *Bullets*, *Gold*, *Silver*, that a Man may *swallow* which he can't *Eat*. Now Christ commanded *Eating* (that is *Chewing*) and his Disciples accordingly, and the Primitive Christians for many hundred Years after Christ, did *Eat* (that is *Chew*) the Sacrament with their Teeth: Nor can a Man be said to have *Receiv'd* the Sacrament that has not *Eaten* it; it's the same thing to put it into his *Pocket* as into his *Mouth* if he *Chew* it not; the one is as much against Christ's Institution and Command as the other. Nor is the *Chewing* of the Sacrament without it's great significance, setting forth the *bruising of his Body* in order to become a *Sacrifice for our Sins*. Nor was the *swallowing* of the Consecrated Wafer us'd in the *Roman Church*, till the Invention of an *Invisible* and *Indivisible* Presence of Christ's *natural Body* in the Sacrament was found out, which was long after *Berengarius* his time; in whose days the *Roman Church* held the *Body* of Christ in the Sacrament to be *Divisible*. And their many Stories of Christ's appearing in the Sacrament in the Form of *Lambs* and *Children*, proves they held his *Body* therein to be *Visible* too.

But suppose Christ had only requir'd us to *swallow* his Body, how can it be *swallow'd* if it have no *extension of Parts*. If it be in the Sacrament *Invisibly* and *Indivisibly* (*after the manner of a Spirit* and not of a Body) it can't be *swallow'd*. No Man can *swallow* a *Spirit*, or put a *Cherubim* into his *Stomach* or *Belly*; he may as well *Feed* on *second Notions*, and *Dance* in a *Vacuity*. It is simply impossible for any Man to *swallow* that which can neither be *seen*, *felt*, *tasted*, nor any manner of way be capable of *suffering*, unless it be such a Man as can *swallow* any *Gudgeon* whatever.

Answ.

Answer. To this *Argument* the *Romish Doctors* (who are wonderful Artists at the coining of admirable distinctions to help their Cause at a dead list) give this Answer, That the *Body of Christ* is *Toucht* and *Eaten* in the Sacrament *extrinsecally* but not *intrinsecally*, for the *Accidents* under which it lies being *Eaten*, his *Body* may be said to be *extrinsecally Eaten*, tho' it be not *Eaten intrinsecally*, i. e. in it self.

Reply. If we reduce this subtle distinction to plain English, we shall find nothing in it but a two-fold piece of gross Nonsense. For they here first suppose, that in the Sacrament we can in a Corporeal manner Touch and Eat the meer Accidents of Bread, i. e. we can Eat and Feed on the meer Figure, the Colour, the Taste and Smell of Bread, without Eating one Crumb of real Bread it self. Food that will just signify as much to nourish our Bodys, as this supposition dos to enlighten our Minds. And then Secondly they more sottishly suppose, that we may be said to Eat Christ's Body (in a Corporeal manner) when we do not so much as Eat any of the forementioned Accidents of his Body, but Eat only the Colour and Shape, and Smell, and Taste of another Substance as different from his Body, as Bread is from Flesh. And all this, because Christ's Body, as they suppose, lurks under these Accidents of Bread, tho' our Teeth can no more come at his Body it self then if it were a thousand Miles off. And if this be any other then an heap of Nonsense and Contradictions under the colour of a grave distinction, I must Confess I despair of understanding it. I shall only add, that if Christ's Body cou'd be said to be Toucht or Eaten, because the Accidents are Toucht and Eaten, then must Christ's Body be liable to such changes as the Accidents are liable to, and such absurdities will hereon ensue as are not fit to be mention'd.

In the second place we argue, That if Christ's natural Body be Corporeally present in the Sacrament, it must be therein either broken or not broken. Argument II.

That the Body of Christ in the Sacrament can't be broken, the Roman Church acknowledges for these reasons, 1. Because it has no extension of parts in the Sacrament. 2. Because Christ's natural Body is now impassible.

On the other side, if Christ's natural Body be Corporeally present in the Sacrament it must be broken; otherwise, the words of the Institution can't be verifi'd in their literal Sense, viz. *This is my Body which is broken for you.*

The 1 Cor. 11. 24.

Answer.

The Roman Doctor's Answer to this Argument is the same which they gave to the former. They tell us, that the natural Body of Christ in the Sacrament is *broken extrinsecè*, but not *intrinsecè*, that is to say, *broken under the species of Bread*, but *not in it self*.

Reply.

We reply as before, saying, that this Answer is no better then profound Nonsense. For if the Body of Christ be *broken under the species of Bread*, it must needs be *broken in it self*. If they mean that the *Species only* are *broken*, then must it follow, that the *Body* is not *broken*, but only the *Species* under which the *Body* lies. The *Species* are not the *Body*, but *separable* from the *Body*; therefore if the *Body* be *broken* under the *Species*, it must be *broken in it self*.

Argument II.

2. Its impossible to *break Accidents* without *breaking* some *Substance* with 'em; therefore the *Body* of Christ *remaining under the species of Bread*, must be either *broken* in the Sacrament, or *not broken*. If it be *not broken*, it can't be Christ's *Sacramental Body*; if it be *broken*, it can't be his *natural Body*. Therefore forasmuch as Christ's *natural Body* is in Heaven glorify'd, *immortal* and *impassible*, and that Christ's *Body* in the Sacrament must be *broken* (otherwise the words of the Institution can't be verify'd) Christ's *natural Body* can't be his *Sacramental Body*, and consequently, not *Corporeally present* in the Sacrament.

Argum. III.

3. If the *Eating* Christ's *natural Body* in the Sacrament be not a *Corporeal Eating*, then is not the *Presence* of Christ's *natural Body* in the Sacrament a *Corporeal Presence*. And that the *Eating* thereof is not a *Corporeal Eating*, the following Reasons prove.

Reason I.

1. Because to a *Corporeal Eating* of Christ's *natural Body*, many *Miracles* are requir'd: *Durandus* mentions *Eleven*, some make their number greater; others say, they are *innumerable*. Now it can't be suppos'd, that God shou'd hourly work *infinite numbers* of *superfluous Miracles* (for so they must be judg'd) if there be no necessity of a *Corporeal Eating* Christ's *natural Body* in the Sacrament. Of which that there is not the least necessity is evident. 1. Because the *Eating* Christ *Corporeally* can't be necessary for *Corporeal nourishment*. Our *Bodys* can't be *Corporeally nourish'd* with the *Body of Christ*. 2. It can't be necessary for *Spiritual nourishment*, the *Graces* of God's Spirit being the *Food* appointed for our *Souls*; *Faith* is the proper *nutriment* of the *Soul* of Man.

Man. All the Promises of Life and Salvation are in Scripture made to Faith, or Believing. To Eat Christ Spiritually is sufficient to strengthen our inward Man, sufficient to Convey all the benefits of Christ's Passion, to the Strengthening, Comforting, and Refreshing our Souls. Therefore there is not the least necessity of a Corporeal Eating Christ's natural Body to the aforefaid ends. Christ tells us, Joh. 6. 63. *That the Flesh profits nothing*, therefore if we cou'd Eat Christ Corporeally in the Sacrament, it wou'd not in the least avail us.

2. If the Natural Body of Christ be Corporeally eaten in the Sacrament, it must either be eaten in the Sense of the *Carnalites* (that is Chewed with the Teeth) which (as before said) was the Doctrine of the Roman Church Six hundred Years ago, when *Berengarius* liv'd: Or in the Sense of the present Roman Church. That it is not eaten in the former Sense, is on all Sides acknowledg'd; and that it is not eaten in the latter Sense, has been fully prov'd in the first Argument.

3. If Christ's natural Body be Corporeally eaten in the Sacrament, then must the Fathers have eaten him Corporeally before his Incarnation (for he is no otherwise eaten by us than he was by them) St. Paul tells us that they did all eat the same Spiritual meat, and did all drink the same Spiritual Drink (that is Christ, as he after explains it, 1. Cor. 10. 3. 4.) Whatever Christ has required us to eat, they did eat the same: But the Fathers cou'd not eat Christ's natural Body Corporeally, before his Incarnation; because it was not then assum'd: Nor can we eat it now, because it is gone to Heaven. They did eat him Spiritually under the Sacrament of Manna, and we under the Sacraments of Bread and Wine, since we eat the same Spiritual meat they did, must eat him only in a Spiritual Sense. And if they by eating him Spiritually were nourish't up to Eternal Life, why may not we?

4. If the natural Body of Christ be Corporeally eaten in the Sacrament then must the eating of Christ's Body in the Sacrament be the Action of our Bodys, and the Benefit of eating come from the Body to the Soul; but it's otherwise: The Benefit of eating comes from the Soul to the Body. St. Paul tells us he that eats unworthily receives no benefit from his Eating; therefore it's the Soul's preparation that makes a Man a worthy Communicant; and therefore the Eating Christ worthily must be the Soul's action, and consequently only a Spiritual Eating.

5. If

Reason 5.

5. If the *natural Body* of Christ be *Corporeally Eaten* in the Sacrament; then must the *nourishment* we receive from Christ's *Body* in the Sacrament be *Corporeal nourishment* (for it must *nourish* as it is *Eaten*). It is on all sides acknowledg'd, that the *Body* of Christ in the Sacrament dos not *Corporeally nourish*, therefore it must be acknowledg'd, that Christ's *natural Body* is not *Corporeally Eaten* in the Sacrament.

Reason 6.

6. If the *natural Body* of Christ be *Corporeally Eaten* in the Sacrament then must it *pass into the Draught*. *Whatever entreteth in at the Mouth goeth into the Belly, and is cast into the Draught* (saith Christ, Matt. 15. 17. v.)

Answer.

Answer. The *Roman Doctors* tells us, that these words of Christ are only to be understood of what is *Eaten to nourish the Body*.

Reply I.

Reply I. There is nothing that *goeth into the Mouth and Belly* whether it *nourish* or not *nourish*, but *passes into the Draught*. If a Man swallow *Stones* and *Bullets*, tho' they *nourish* not, yet they *pass into the Draught*; the like may be said of *Physick* that is taken to make Men Lean.

2. That the *Consecrated Bread* and *Wine* *nourishes the Body*, both *Reason* and *Experience* teaches. That *Priest* that can have sufficient of the *Consecrated Host* and *Cup*, will never *starve* for want of *Bodily nourishment*. Nor can any reason be given to the contrary, but that if the *natural Body* of Christ be *Eaten Corporeally* or *naturally*, it must prove subject to *Affections* and *Transmutations* natural.

By the *Gloss* of the *Canon Law* it is determin'd, that as long as the *species* of *Bread* and *Wine* remain *uncorrupted*, the *Body* of Christ remains under these *Species*; and consequently the *Holy Body* may be *vomited* up and *ejected* by all ways thro' which the *Species* may *pass* unalter'd, and that may be *downward* as well as *upward*.

There is a *Prayer* in the *Roman Missal* Publish'd by the *Council of Trent* and command of *Pope Pius the fourth*, wherein the *Priest* is injoyn'd to use these words, *ut Corpus tuum, Domine quod sumpsi, & sanguis quem potavi adhereat visceribus meis: Let this Body, O Lord, which I have taken, and thy Blood which I have drunk adhere to my Bowels: And if the Body of Christ descend to the Bowels, why not elsewhere? The Jesuit Vasquez* tells us, that tho' it shou'd be *vomited* up, yet is it to be ador'd. And this is the prevailing Opinion of the *Roman Church*. And thus much shall suffice to shew the *Absurdities*

in 3. Tho. 13.
dist. 195.

dities that follow upon a Corporeal Eating of Christ's natural Body in the Sacrament.

4. If the Union of the Faithful to Christ in the Sacra- Argument 4.
ment is not a Corporeal Union, then is not the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament a Corporeal Presence (for the Presence being in order to Union, such as the Union is, such only must the Presence be) now if the Union betwixt Christ and the Faithful in the Sacrament were Corporeal, it must follow, that either the Faithful shou'd be Corporeally and Substantially united to Christ, and consequently to God (and what is Consubstantial with God must needs be God). Or 2dly. That Christ shou'd have a double Subsistence, one Divine in the second Person of the ever Blessed Trinity, the other Human, viz. the Subsistence of their Body's with whom he is Incorporated.

That the Faithful are no otherwise united to Christ, than they are to the Father, is evident from Joh. 17. 21. where Christ Prays for his Disciples, that they might be all one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; so they also may be one in us. As the Faithful are in the Son, so are they in the Father; and as the Son inhabits in the Faithful, so do's the Father; and as the Son is united to the Faithful, so is the Father. And what kind of Inhabitation and Union this is, the Scripture informs us, 1 Joh. 4. 13 v. 1 Cor. 6. 17 v. We know that he dwelleth in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit, and he that is joyn'd to the Lord is one Spirit.

5. If the Communion with Christ in the Sacrament is not a Corporeal Communion, then is not the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament a Corporeal Presence (for the End of Christ's exhibition of his Presence in the Sacrament is, that the Faithful may have Communion with him) for this reason St. Paul calls the Sacrament the Communion of the Body of Christ. 1. Cor. 10. 16 v. Now, that the Communion of the Faithful with Christ in the Sacrament, is not a Corporeal but only a Spiritual Communion, the following Reasons prove.

Argument 5.

1. Because the Faithful's Communion with Christ is founded on their Union; if therefore their Union be not Corporeal, their Communion can't be a Corporeal Communion. Reason 1.

2. The Faithful have no other Communion with the Son Reason 2.
then they have with the Father. Our Fellowship (saith the Apostle) is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. 1 Joh.

1. 3, 4 v. *He that keepeth my Commandments (saith Christ) my Father and I will love him, and make our abode with him.*
 + Joh. 14. 23 v. *The Son abideth in us no otherwise than the Father doth; and we know (saith the Apostle) the Father*
 1 John 4. 13. *dwelleth in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.*

Reason 3. 3. The same Communion the Faithful have with Christ in the Sacrament of Baptism; the same and no other have they with him in the Sacrament of his Supper (the Communion as to the kind of it is alike in both Sacraments, tho' in degree they may differ). In the Sacrament of Baptism, the Communion is not Corporeal, but only Spiritual: Therefore the Communion of the Faithful with Christ, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not a Corporeal but only a Spiritual Communion.

Reason 4. Lastly. The same Communion that Abraham and other Holy Patriarchs had with Christ before his Incarnation; the same and no other have the Faithful with Christ in the Sacrament. Their Communion before Christ's Incarnation was only Spiritual, and the Faithful now, since his Ascension (being the same only which they had) can be no other than a Spiritual Communion. These Arguments I judge sufficient to prove, That the natural Body of Christ is not Corporeally present in the Sacrament.

CHAP. XI.

Containing such Scriptures as prove Christ's natural Body not to be Corporeally in the Sacrament.

HAVING laid down such Reasons as prove, that the natural Body of Christ is not Corporeally present in the Sacrament: I proceed to Consider such Scriptures as disprove Christ's Corporeal Presence therein. I begin with

1 Scrip.

Acts 3. 21 v. In which Verse St. Peter tells the Jews, That the Heavens must receive Christ, till the times of Restoration of all things, which God had spoken by the Mouths of all his Holy Prophets; that is, till all Scripture Prophecy be fulfilled. Had St. Peter believ'd Christ to have been Corporeally present on Earth every Hour in the Day, present in Saul and

and Body; not in one Place, but in many thousands; he wou'd not have put such a Stumbling-block before the Faith of Christians, as the telling of 'em, that the *Heavens must receive Christ until the Day of Judgment*, must necessarily be; I say, that if St. Peter had believ'd that Christ was present in Soul and Body, every Hour in the Day where the Host is Consecrated; he wou'd have told the Jews, that tho' the *Heavens* were the only Place where he visibly *Appear'd*, yet had he his being upon Earth also.

I appeal to every *Judicious Roman Catholick*, whether if any of their *Doctors* shou'd tell the World in his Sermons or Writings, that *the Heavens must receive Christ until the Day of Judgment*, without making mention of his being visible only there? Whether he wou'd not soon be Censur'd by his Brethren for an *Heretick*, and a denyer of Christ's *Corporeal Presence* here on Earth?

Perhaps some may Object, Did not St. Paul see Christ on Object. Earth? Did he not hear his Voice? and was he not struck to the Earth with the glory of his Presence? And do's not he tell us, that *Christ was seen of him*? Therefore Christ must either leave Heaven, or be in Heaven and on Earth in the same instant. Acts 9. 3, 4.
5 v.
1 Cor. 15.
8 v.

Ans^w. That St. Paul saw Christ is certain, but when or in what manner, the Scriptures do not inform us. We read 2. Cor. 12. 2 v. that he was caught up into the third Heaven; and then it was he saw Christ (as some are of Opinion) others are of Opinion, it was in his Journey to Damascus when Christ spoke to him, that Christ appear'd to him in that glorious Light that from Heaven shone about him, and that he saw Christ in Heaven as St. Stephen did. And neither of these Suppositions invalidate the Argument from this Text.

The second Scripture is, 1 Cor. 11. 26 v. where St. Paul tells us, that *as oft as we Eat this Bread, we shew forth the Lord's Death till he come*. St. Paul do's not say till he come visibly, but till he come; this Ordinance is to be Celebrated till Christ come, and no longer: Now if Christ be both in Soul and Body present here on Earth, this Ordinance is to cease. For how can he be said to come, more than to come in Soul and Body? and to be present in millions of Places every Hour of the Day? The distinction of a visible and invisible coming, can't satisfy any learn'd, rational, unprejudic'd Reader of the Text. Script. 2.

52 *Christ's Corporeal Presence against Scripture.*

Script. 3.

The *third Scripture* is, John 12. 8 v. where *Christ* tells *Judas Iscariot* and others, that *the Poor they had always with 'em; but him they shou'd not have always*: His meaning being as appears from the 7th v. that he was in a short time to Suffer, and then to leave 'em and depart out of this World.

Answer.

To this and other Scriptures the *Roman Church* gives no other Answer, but that they are to be understood of denying his Church, his *visible Presence*.

Reply.

Reply, They can't be so understood by any considering Man that observes the Coherence of the Text. And by the like *Additions*, Men may make what Constructions they please to pass on Scripture.

Our Saviour saith expressly, *Me ye shall not have always; the Poor ye have, but me ye shall not have*; which words, considering the Circumstances Christ was then under, with the plainness and sincerity of the Speaker, must infer his *Corporeal Absence*. I know not how an honest Man can express his *departure out of this World*, in more plain, pithy, and significant words.

Script. 4.

The *fourth Scripture* is, Joh. 16. 17 v. Christ tells his Disciples, that *unless he go away, the Comforter cannot come*, Christ do's not say, unless you lose the *visible Presence of my Body, the Comforter cannot come*; but *unless I go away*: which must denote a *Bodily Absence*. The *Comforter was to come*, not to supply the sight of Christ's Person, but to Teach and Instruct the Church in the place of Christ, who was *Corporeally to go away*, and the *Comforter to succeed him*.

Script. 5.

The *fifth Scripture* is, Joh. 16. 28 v. where Christ tells his Disciples, that *he came from the Father, and came into the World, and behold (saith he) I leave the World and go unto the Father*.

Were Christ in *Soul and Body* present here on Earth, as oft as the Sacrament is administred, he wou'd certainly have comforted his Disciples, by acquainting of 'em, that they shou'd only lose the *visible Presence of his Body*. For to have been assur'd, that Christ wou'd be present with 'em in *Soul and Body* (tho' they had not seen him) wou'd doubtless have administ'ed matter of much joy and satisfaction to 'em. Nor is it much material, whether they saw him or no, if they were assur'd and certain that he was *Bodily present with 'em*. A Friend in the dark or behind a Curtain, is as much present as if he were in the open light, and beheld with the Eyes.

Had

Had Christ intended to have given his Church the *Corporeal Presence* of his *Body*, he wou'd questionless have comforted his Disciples (who were much dejected and cast down upon the Narrative of his *departure from 'em*) by acquainting of 'em, that tho' he went to *Heaven*, yet shou'd they not be depriv'd of the *Presence* of his *Body*, but shou'd have it *more* then *before*; and much *better* for his Church: That his *Body* was then but in *one Congregation*, but hereafter shou'd be in *thousands at a time*. And not only *among them*, and *with them*, but also *in them*; in *their Churches*, in *their Boxes*, in *their Mouths*, in *their Stomachs*; nay, in *their very Bowels*, and *stick to their very Entrails* (all which that *Petition* must import, which the *Priest* is commanded to use (as before said) *ut Corpus tuum, Domine, adhaereat visceribus meis!*) Such a *Declaration* as this, wou'd have been a comfort so suitable to the then present State and Condition of his Disciples, and have so reviv'd their dejected Spirits, that doubtless had Christ intended any such thing, he wou'd upon so seasonable an *Occasion*, have acquainted them therewith. But Christ tells 'em no such thing; but that he must now *leave 'em* and *go unto the Father*, and *send the Comforter* to *supply his Absence*.

" Lord *Jesus* send thy *Comforter* into our *Hearts*, and give us thy *Corporeal Presence* when we *leave this World*:
" And we'll require no more.

I therefore shall Conclude my Scripture Proofs with our Blessed Lord's Advice, Matt. 24. 23 v. *If any say unto you, loe! here is Christ, or there is Christ; believe them not. If any shall say to you that Christ is Corporally on the Altar, or that the Pix is Christ, believe them not.*

C H A P. XII.

Wherein such Scriptures are Consider'd as are made use of by the Roman Church, to prove Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament.

HAVING prov'd from the Evidences of Reason and Scripture that the *Natural Body* of Christ is not *Corporeally present* in the Sacrament : I proceed to Answer what is urg'd by the *Roman Church* in Proof thereof.

There are *two Scriptures* insisted on to prove it, the *first* is, Joh. 6. 53 v. The *other* is, 1 Cor. 11. 29 v. both which Scriptures we shall in their order consider.

Script. 1.

I begin with Joh. 6. 53 v. *Except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no Life in you.* This Scripture is much insisted upon by the present *Roman Church*, to justify their Doctrine of the *Corporeal eating and drinking the natural Flesh and Blood of Christ* in the Sacrament. But how little it makes for them will soon be evident. In order to which, I shall lay down two Conclusions.

Prop. 1.

1. The *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* (requir'd in this Text) *relates not to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

Prop. 2.

2. The *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* mention'd in this Text, is not literally but only *Spiritually* to be understood.

I begin with the *first* of these Propositions or Conclusions, and in Proof thereof, offer the following *Reasons* to the Reader's Consideration.

Reason 1.

1. These words were spoke by Christ *above a Year* before the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was Instituted. There were *two Passovers* that succeeded the speaking of these words (as appears by comparing John 6. 4 v. with Chap. 7. 2 v. and Chap. 12. 55 v.) now the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* was not Instituted till the *last Passover* was Celebrated and Abrogated : *Then*, and not before it became *God's Ordinance*. But the *eating and drinking Christ's Flesh and Blood* requir'd in this Text, was a *Duty* necessary when Christ

Christ spoke those words. Therefore they can't relate to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

2. Christ tells us in this Text, that the *actual eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, is *absolutely necessary* to Salvation. Christ do's not say, *unless you desire to eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and desire to drink his Blood*: But expressly, *unless ye eat and drink, &c. Eternal Life* (I say) is *annext*, not to the *desire of eating and drinking*, but to the *eating and drinking actually*. Now if this Text related to the Sacrament, none cou'd be sav'd but such as did actually partake thereof: Wherefore such of the *Fathers* as were of Opinion that this Text related to the Sacrament, gave it to *Infants*, which Practice no *Learned Romanist* will defend.

3. If the *eating and drinking Christ's Flesh and Blood* requir'd in this Text, *related to the Sacrament*, then shou'd every one that receives the Sacrament (inasmuch as he *eats Christ's Flesh and drinks Christ's Blood*) *have Eternal Life abiding in him, have Christ dwelling in 'em, and they in him*; Read v. 54: 56. (an easy way found out by the *Roman Church* to bring *Murderers* and *Adulterers* unto Heaven, it is but *eating the Sacrament*, and *they have Eternal Life abiding in 'em*).

Those of the *Roman Church* are not able to extricate themselves from this Consequence that follows their Doctrine. They can't deny, but that if this Text be understood of the Sacrament, every *wicked Man* that Eats the Sacrament, must *eat Christ's Flesh and drink Christ's Blood*; the only shift that they have to escape by, is by telling us, that the Promise of *Eternal Life, &c.* is not *annext simply* to the *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood*; but to a *conditional eating and drinking of it*: that is to say, to the *eating and drinking of it worthily*. Answer.

We Reply 1. That Christ here mentions *no Condition*. Reply 1. He doth not say, that he that *eats and drinks worthily his Flesh and Blood*, hath *Eternal Life abiding in him*; but only saith, *he that eats and drinks, &c.* Had Christ said, he that eats and drinks his Flesh and Blood, *shall have Eternal Life abiding in him*; then the *Condition* of *eating worthily* with some probability might be imply'd (because in *promises de futuro*, *Conditions* are usually imply'd). But Christ speaks *de Prasenti*, he hath it in present being; he that *eateth my Flesh and drinking my Blood* hath *Eternal Life*: by the very act of eating he is in a state of Grace. He e then can be no *Condition imply'd*,

C H A P. XII.

Wherein such Scriptures are Consider'd as are made use of by the Roman Church, to prove Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament.

HAVING prov'd from the Evidences of Reason and Scripture that the *Natural Body* of Christ is not *Corporeally present* in the Sacrament: I proceed to Answer what is urg'd by the *Roman Church* in Proof thereof.

There are *two Scriptures* insisted on to prove it, the first is, Joh. 6. 53 v. The other is, 1 Cor. 11. 29 v. both which Scriptures we shall in their order consider.

Script. 1.

I begin with Joh. 6. 53 v. *Except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no Life in you.* This Scripture is much insisted upon by the present *Roman Church*, to justify their Doctrine of the *Corporeal eating and drinking the natural Flesh and Blood of Christ* in the Sacrament. But how little it makes for them will soon be evident. In order to which, I shall lay down two Conclusions.

Prop. 1.

1. The *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* (requir'd in this Text) *relates not to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

Prop. 2.

2. The *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* mention'd in this Text, is not literally but only *Spiritually* to be understood.

I begin with the first of these Propositions or Conclusions, and in Proof thereof, offer the following Reasons to the Reader's Consideration.

Reason 1.

1. These words were spoke by Christ *above a Year* before the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was Instituted. There were *two Passovers* that succeeded the speaking of these words (as appears by comparing John 6. 4 v. with Chap. 7. 2 v. and Chap. 12. 55 v.) now the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* was not Instituted till the *last Passover* was Celebrated and Abrogated: Then, and not before it became *God's Ordinance*. But the *eating and drinking Christ's Flesh and Blood* requir'd in this Text, was a Duty necessary when Christ

Christ spoke those words. Therefore they can't relate to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

2. Christ tells us in this Text, that the *actual eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, is absolutely necessary to Salvation. Reason 1. Christ do's not say, *unless you desire to eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and desire to drink his Blood*: But expressly, *unless ye eat and drink, &c. Eternal Life* (I say) is annext, not to the desire of eating and drinking, but to the eating and drinking actually. Now if this Text related to the Sacrament, none cou'd be sav'd but such as did actually partake thereof: Wherefore such of the *Fathers* as were of Opinion that this Text related to the Sacrament, gave it to *Infants*, which Practice no Learned *Romanist* will defend.

3. If the eating and drinking Christ's Flesh and Blood requir'd in this Text, related to the Sacrament, then shou'd every one that receives the Sacrament (inasmuch as he eats Christ's Flesh and drinks Christ's Blood) have *Eternal Life abiding in him, have Christ dwelling in 'em, and they in him*; Read v. 54. 56. (an easy way found out by the *Roman Church* to bring *Murderers* and *Adulterers* unto Heaven, it is but eating the Sacrament, and they have *Eternal Life abiding in 'em*).

Those of the *Roman Church* are not able to extricate themselves from this Consequence that follows their Doctrine. They can't deny, but that if this Text be understood of the Sacrament, every *wicked Man* that Eats the Sacrament, must eat Christ's Flesh and drink Christ's Blood; the only shift that they have to escape by, is by telling us, that Answer. the Promise of *Eternal Life, &c.* is not annext simply to the eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood; but to a conditional eating and drinking of it: that is to say, to the eating and drinking of it worthily.

We Reply 1. That Christ here mentions no Condition. Reply 1. He doth not say, that he that eats and drinks worthily his Flesh and Blood, hath *Eternal Life abiding in him*; but only saith, *he that eats and drinks, &c.* Had Christ said, he that eats and drinks his Flesh and Blood, shall have *Eternal Life abiding in him*; then the Condition of eating worthily with some probability might be imply'd (because in *promises de futuro*, Conditions are usually imply'd). But Christ speaks *de Prasenti*, he hath it in present being; he that eateth my Flesh and drinking my Blood hath *Eternal Life*: by the very act of eating he is in a state of Grace. He e then can be no Condition imply'd,

ply'd, but the *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood*. In like manner Christ tells us, v. 56. that *he that eateth his Flesh and drinketh his Blood, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him*. The *Inhabitation* follows immediately upon the acts of *eating and drinking*.

Reply 2.

Verse 58.

2. It is *impossible to eat Christ's Flesh and drink Christ's Blood unworthily*, for the very *eating and drinking thereof* supposes the Eater to do it *worthily*. Our Saviour opposes the *eating of his Flesh*, to the *Israelites eating Manna in the Wilderness*; he tells 'em, *their Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness*, and *dye'd Eternally*; but he that *eats his Flesh and drinks his Blood*, *shall not dye Eternally*. Why did the *Fathers perish* who did *eat Manna*? the reason is, because they did *eat it unworthily*; had they *eaten the Manna worthily*, they had not *perish'd*. But here lies the benefit of *eating Christ's Body* above the *eating Manna*; because the very *eating thereof* supposes the Eater to do it *worthily*; which the *eating of Manna* did not. The Eater of Christ's Flesh *can't eat it unworthily*, and therefore on the act of *Eating* becomes united to Christ, and *has Eternal Life abiding in him*. This is plain demonstration, and therefore needs not be Confirm'd by Proofs out of *Fathers*, who distinguish betwixt the *Sacrament*, and the *thing* whereby it is a *Sacrament*, affirming that all that are *Partakers of the latter must receive it unto Life*.

Reason 4.

4. If the *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* requir'd in this Text, related to the *Sacrament*, then without *drinking of the Cup* no Man cou'd be saved. A dreadful Text indeed to the *Laity of the Roman Church*.

Answer.

The *Roman Doctors* tell us, that their *Laity drink Christ's Blood* when they *eat Christ's Body*; because *Christ's Blood* by way of *Concomitancy* is in *Christ's Body*: And therefore in *eating the one*, they *drink the other also*.

Reply 1.

We Reply in the first Place, that *Blood* in a *Body* can't be *drunk*, it may be *eaten with the Body*, but not *drunk*: *eating and drinking* are distinct acts, and admit of *Contradictory Prædicates*.

Reply 2.

2. Christ do's not say, unless *ye eat my Flesh or drink my Blood*; but unless you *eat and drink*, so that if the *Blood* cou'd be *drunk with the Body*, it wou'd not be *such a drinking* as Christ requires: It's *Blood pour'd forth*, not in a *Body*, which Christ commands us to *drink of*. A Man may *eat Body and Blood together*; but can't be said to *drink that Blood* which he *eat with the Body*.

3. If a Man may drink Christ's Blood by way of Concomitancy when he eats Christ's Flesh, then do's the Priest drink Christ's Blood twice, yea, and eat Christ's Flesh twice in the same Sacrament: For the Body of Christ is in his Blood by way of Concomitancy, as much as his Blood is in his Body. And consequently Christ in the first Institution of the Sacrament shou'd have given his Disciples his Blood twice, and his Body twice; his Blood when he gave his Body, and his Body when he gave his Blood. And the Chalice may as well be drunk without the Host, as the Host be eaten without the Chalice. And a Man may be said as well to eat Christ's Flesh, when he drinks Christ's Blood; as to drink Christ's Blood, when he eats Christ's Flesh. And so to drink what he eats, and to eat what he drinks.

In the Council of Trent, this Text being urg'd by some Members of that Council, to prove the necessity of the Communion of the Cup to the Laity; the Opposers of it knew no other way to evade its force, but by affirming it did not relate to the Sacrament, but only to Faith under the Metaphor of nourishment: alledging in proof thereof many sayings of the Fathers, especially of St. Austin. Of the same Opinion we find the most Learn'd Roman Writers to have been, who liv'd before Bellarmine's time, as Joannes de Ragusio, Biel, Cusanus, Ruard, Tapperus, Cajetan, Hessels, Jansenius, Waldensis, Armachanus, and divers others, who to justify the lawfulness of denying the Communion under both kinds to the Laity (against the Hussites) affirm'd this Text not to have relation to the Sacrament. And therefore such Romanists as apply this Text to the Sacrament, wou'd do well to Consider, that it infers the same necessity of drinking the Chalice as of eating the Host; and that we perish if we omit either.

5. If the eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood requir'd John 6. 53 v. related to the Sacrament, it wou'd rather infer Christ's Flesh to be chang'd into Bread, then Bread to be chang'd into Christ's Flesh. Christ tells us in the 36 v. of this Chapter, that he is the Bread of Life: If any Man (saith he) eats of this Bread he shall live for ever; and the Bread that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.

Reason 5:

Here say the Roman Doctors, is the Promise of what Christ fulfill'd in the Institution of the Sacrament. Now let us

Q

compare

compare these words with the words of the Institution; which faith, that Christ took Bread, and when he had blessed it and brake it, he gave it to his Disciples, calling it his Body: That all the Accidents of Bread remain is on all sides acknowledged, therefore if there be any change made of the Substance, it must be of Christ's Flesh into Bread; and not of Bread into Christ's Flesh. Therefore the aforesaid Promise relates not to the Sacrament, but to his Death on the Cross, at which time, he gave his Flesh for the Life of the World.

Prop. 2.

Thus having prov'd my first Proposition, That the eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood mention'd in this Text, relates not to the Sacrament: I proceed to the second, That the eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood, requir'd John 6. 53 v. is not to be understood in a literal, but only in a Spiritual Sense, viz. of Faith or Believing, under the metaphor of eating and drinking. Reasons proving it are,

Reason 1.

1. Because there is no eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood absolutely necessary to Eternal Life, but the Spiritual eating and drinking of it. That the eating and drinking Christ's Flesh and Blood requir'd in this Text, is absolutely necessary to Eternal Life, has been prov'd.

Reason 2.

2. Because a Corporeal eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood is impossible to be done; and unprofitable if it were really done, as has been prov'd, Chap. X.

Reason 3.

3. Because Christ tells us v. 35. That he prevents hunger and thirst, not by being Corporeally devour'd, but by being approached to and believed in: he that cometh to me (saith Christ) shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst. And when the Capernaïtes mistook his words, understanding 'em of a Corporal eating, v. 61. Christ removes their mistake, by telling 'em, his meaning was not that they shou'd eat him Corporeally; for his Body shou'd ascend to Heaven, from whence he did descend: What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend where he was before. v. 62. and in the following verse tells 'em, That tho' they did eat him Corporeally, it wou'd not much avail 'em; the Flesh (saith he) profiteth nothing, (that is, the eating my Flesh in the Sense you mean, wou'd profit you nothing) it is the Spirit that quickneth: The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life; that is, they are to be understood after a Spiritual manner, and so being receiv'd by you, will bring Life Eternal to you.

4. Because

4. Because the reason why Christ commands us to *eat his Flesh and drink his Blood*, is that *he may dwell in us and we in him*. Such therefore as is Christ's *Inhabitation* in us, such and no other is the *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood* requir'd in this Text: in the same Sense that Christ intends *to dwell in me*, in that and no other Sense has he requir'd me *to eat his Flesh and drink his Blood*.

That Christ's *Inhabitation* in the Faithful is not a *Corporeal* but a *Spiritual Habitation* has been already prov'd Chap. X. Therefore the *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood* requir'd John 6. 53 v. is only to be understood of a *Spiritual eating of him*, and what that is St. *Austin* resolves, *crede & manducasti, believe, and thou hast eaten. Credere in Christum, hoc est manducare panem vivum; qui credit in eum, manducat.* In Johan. Tra. 25, 26.

A second Scripture they Argue from to prove Christ's *Corporeal Presence* in the Sacrament is, 1 Cor. 11. 29 v. wherein St. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians*, that *he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body*. From this Scripture they Infer,

1. That the *Body of Christ* may be *eaten unworthily*, and consequently *eaten by wicked Men*.

2. That Christ's *Body* is *Corporeally present* in the Sacrament, because St. *Paul* blames the *Corinthians* for *not discerning it*.

Ans^r. To the first I Answer, St. *Paul* do's not say, *he that eats and drinks the Lord's Body unworthily, eats and drinks Damnation* (or judgment) *to himself*; but only speaks indefinitely, *he that eats and drinks*: And its very probable had the Speech been proper (to have said *eaten the Body of Christ unworthily*) St. *Paul* wou'd have said so, that he might have laid the greater load on the *Corinthians*. But he not only speaks indefinitely, but expressly tells us, that its only *Bread and Wine* that is in the Sacrament *unworthily eaten and drunk*. v. 27. *He that eats this Bread and drinks this Cup of the Lord unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*. He calls it *Bread*, not the *Lord's Body* that is *unworthily eaten*, and the *Cup of the Lord*, not the *Blood of the Lord* that is *unworthily drunk*. And now in the 28 v. advises 'em to *examine themselves* (as the only means to prevent and remedy this evil) and then let 'em eat, what? *the Lord's Body?* he

saith no such thing : But let 'em eat Bread. Let a Man examine himself and so let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup. And in the following Verse, gives the reason why Examination in order to the eating of this Bread and drinking this Cup is necessary, viz. because he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks Damnation (or Judgment) to himself.

To their second Inference, I Answer, St. Paul do's not blame the Corinthians for not discerning Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament, but for not discerning Christ's representative Presence therein.

In the 21 and 22 Verses, he explains what he means by coming unworthily, that is Schismatically, or Drunk, or meerly to satisfy Hunger ; such as did so approach to the Sacrament, did not discern the Lord's Body ; that is to say, they did not discern, that the Bread and Wine there presented to be receiv'd are not common Bread and Wine, but holy Symbols of Christ's Body and Blood. The approaching therefore to the Sacrament, with Addressee unsuitable to the Representative Body and Blood of Christ, is that which the Apostle here calls a not discerning the Lord's Body. And this to be St. Paul's meaning appears.

1. Because he calls it Bread that is unworthily eaten ; now had it been Christ's natural Body and not Bread, the Apostle wou'd not have call'd it Bread ; nor had it been lawful for him so to have done, or consistent with any tolerable degree of Reverence.

2. He tells the Corinthians, that he that eats this Bread and drinks this Cup of the Lord unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord ; that is to say, of abusing it. As the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is abus'd, so is it present and no otherwise ; the Body of Christ can't be abus'd Naturally and Corporeally ; it is now in Heaven and not capable of any natural Injury, and therefore in a natural Sense, no wicked Man can be guilty of Christ's Body and Blood. But as a relaps'd Christian is said to Crucify the Lord of Life and put him to shame, so he that approaches the Lord's Table unworthily is guilty of his Body and Blood.

Hence I Conclude, it's the Representative Presence, and not the Natural Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, that the Apostle reproves the Corinthians for not discerning.

And

And thus having Answer'd whatever I have Read worth the mentioning in Proof of Christ's *Corporeal Presence* in the Sacrament, I proceed to establish the *third Opinion* I laid down in the proposed Method in the beginning of this Discourse, viz. *That the Body of Christ is really, truly, virtually and Sacramentally present in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

C H A P. XIII.

Wherein is shewn the Manner of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

HAVING prov'd in the foregoing discourse, 1. *that there is no Change made of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lords supper,* as also, 2. *that the natural Body of Christ is not corporally Present in the Sacrament,* I proceed to establish the *Real Presence* thereof in the Sacrament, according to the *Doctrine* and *Sense* of the *Church of England*.

And because there hath much debate arisen about the word (*Reall*) I shall first explain the meaning thereof.

The word *Reall* is a *metaphysical Term*, and may be taken in three Senses, 1. As oppos'd to that which is *Phantastically* or *Imaginarily* present; and imports as much as to be *present in Deed and Truth*; and in this Sense we acknowledge the *Body of Christ* to be *really present* in the Sacrament; that is to say, not *Phantastically* or *Imaginarily Present*: but *Present in Deed and Truth*.

2. The word *Reall* is taken as Oppos'd to that which is *meerly figurative* and barely *Representative*, and imports as much as to be *virtually* and *effectually present*, and in this Sense we acknowledge the *Body of Christ* to be *Really present* in the Sacrament, that is, *virtually* and *effectually present*.

3. The word *Reall* when apply'd to *Body's* is sometimes taken meerly in *Opposition* to *Spiritual*, and imports as much as to be *corporally present*; and this Sense we deny the *Body of Christ* to be *Really present* in the Sacrament.

Quest. Can a *Body* be said to be *Really present* in any place, *Questions* and yet not *Corporally*?

Answ.

62 *The manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament.*

Answ. Yes, it may. And tho' the Roman Church condemn us, as guilty of gross *Absurdity* and *self-contradiction* in owning a *Reall* presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, and yet denying a *corporal*; we return their *Calumny* upon themselves, in not being able or at least not willing to distinguish betwixt the *Reall* and *corporal* presence of a Body.

The Sun is in Heaven in it's Sphere *Locally*, and *Circumscriptively*, yet when it's beams shine into a Room; we say here's the Sun: The Sun is really (that is to say) *virtually* where it's Beams do shine, but not *Corporally*.

The Blood of Christ is *Really* present in Baptism to the washing away of Sin, that is to say *Effectually*, but not *corporally*.

A King is really present where his Ministers of State do sit, who represent his Person, but not *Corporally*.

Even so Christ is *locally* in Heaven: but forasmuch as he has instituted the Elements of Bread and Wine to represent his Person here on earth, we say his Body is *really* present with 'em: because in them (as *Representatives*) he conveys that grace, vertue and power that resides originally in himself.

A *Reall Relative*, a *Reall virtual*, a *Reall Representative*, a *Reall Effectual*, a true *Sacramental Presence* of Christ's Body we acknowledge; but not *Reall corporal*: a *Reall Spiritual* presence we own, but not a *Reall Carnal*.

Reader, observe, that both the Church of England, and the Roman Church do thus far agree; they both acknowledge the Body of Christ to be *Spiritually* present in the Sacrament: The difference betwixt 'em herein lyes.

The Roman Church saith that Christ's Body is therein present *Spiritually* (i. e. existing *invisibly* and *indivisibly*, after the manner of a Spirit, and not of a Body, under the Forms of Bread and Wine).

The Church of England saith that such a *Spiritual* presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, as this which the Romanist's assert, is absolutely *impossible*, but affirms his Body to be in another Sense *Spiritually* present; that is present to the Spirits of the faithful, strengthening and refreshing their Souls with the vertue and efficacy thereof.

Reader, consider, that in the Covenant of Grace, God has made an offer of his Son, upon the conditions of faith and repentance; Believe and Repent (saith God) and I will be-
flow,

flow my Son upon you, to be your Saviour: The Sinner performs the *conditions*, and depends on God for the Performance of his *Promise*. In the Sacrament God gives his Son, and Christ gives himself to the Sinner in the *right* and *relation* of a Saviour.

The consecrated Bread and Wine, are not only to him a Sign of Christ's *Passion*; but a *Channel* to Convey, and an *Instrument* to Confer Christ himself: not *Corporally*, or in *Physical contact*; but *really*, and as *truly*, as if he were *Corporally conferr'd*. The Bread and Wine, are to him not a *naked Image*, but *Christ Representative*. *Physically* consider'd they are Bread and Wine, but *Representatively* consider'd they are the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And in receiving the *Elements of Bread and Wine*, the Believer receives Christ himself *really* and *truly* for his *Head and Saviour*.

Even as a *Princess*, consenting to the nuptials of a foreign *Prince*, receives his *Picture* from his *Ambassador*, delivering it in this form of words, *This is the King who hereby giveth himself unto you*. In this *Act* the *Ambassador* not only gives the *King's Picture*, but the *King's Person* to her; and the *Princess* receives, not only the *Picture*, but *really and truly* the *Person* of the *Prince*, for her *Lord and Husband*: And thus is the *Body of Christ* conferr'd on the *Believing Soul* in the *Sacrament*. And did not the *Pride* in *making of a God*, and *gain in Sacrificing a God*, hinder, this Interpretation wou'd be readily admitted by those, who at present with fire and faggot oppose it.

C H A P. XIV.

Containing a short Historical Narrative of the Beginning and Progress of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and of Christ's Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

HAVING now thro' God's Assistance laid down such Arguments as are by Learned Protestants deduc'd from *Sense, Reason* and *Scripture* (so far as they have occur'd to my Reading) to disprove the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as also *Christ's Corporal Presence in the Sacrament*; and having answer'd all such Arguments, as I have met with in the writings

tings of Learned Men of the *Romish Persuasion* in proof of the said Doctrines; as also having shewn in what Sense the *Church of England* holds the *Body of Christ* to be present in the Sacrament: I now proceed to give the Reader a short *historical narrative* of the *Beginning and Progress* of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and of *Christ's Corporal Presence* in the Sacrament, with which I shall conclude.

The word *Transubstantiation* was first invented by *Stephen*, Bishop of *Augustodunum* in his book *de Sacramentis altaris* about the year of our Lord 1110. But not generally us'd till the *Lateran Council* held under *Pope Innocent III.* in the year of our Lord 1215.

The Opinion of the *Corporal Presence* and *Carnal Manducation* of *Christ's Body and Blood* is of more ancient standing.

The first Person that wrote in Defence of *Christ's Corporal Presence* in the Sacrament (as *Bellarmino* informs us) was *Paschasius Ratbertus*: he liv'd in the Year of our Lord 850, of whom *Bellarmino* thus writes.

“ *Paschasius Ratbertus* Abbot of *Gorbien* flourish't under
 “ *Pope Leo* the fourth, and *Charles* the Bald. He wrote
 “ a famous Book concerning the *Body and Blood* of *Christ*;
 “ which is extant in the *Library* of the holy fathers. He
 “ was the first Author that wrote seriously and largely concerning the truth of our Lord's *Body and Blood* in the
 “ Sacrament against *Bertram* Presbyter, who was (*ex primis*) of the first that brought it into doubt.

And the *Jesuit Syrmundus* tells us, that he was the first that did so explicate the true Sense of the Church; that he open'd the way to those many who wrote afterwards on the same subject.

Reader, here in the first place, take notice that *Bellarmino* acknowledges *Paschasius* to have been the first that wrote seriously in defence of *Christ's Corporal Presence* in the Sacrament. 2. That he saith he writ against *Bertram* who maintain'd the contrary Doctrine.

Here we have *Bellarmino's* (the *Roman's* great Champion) acknowledgment, that the Opinion of the *Corporal Presence* of *Christ's Body* in the Sacrament was oppos'd above eight hundred Years ago. Yea, before any wrote Seriously for it (if *Bellarmino* be in the truth, but indeed as soon as any wrote seriously for it (as we shall manifest) And whereas *Bellarmino* saith that *Bertram* was *ex primis*, one of the first that caused any doubt to arise herein, (besides that the quite contrary may

may be evidenc'd from the writings of the Fathers, as is sufficiently prov'd by many Learn'd Protestants). *Paschasius* himself acknowledges it was a thing much doubted of, as appears in an Epistle the said *Paschasius* wrote to one *Frudegardus*, which Epistle is annex't to his other writings.

Frudegardus reading the third Book of St. *Austin De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, and there finding that the eating Christ's Flesh, and drinking Christ's Blood, was a figurative manner of Speech; began to doubt of what he had formerly read in the aforesaid Treatise of *Paschasius*: which mov'd *Paschasius* to write to him again of the same Subject, as of a thing wherein many were then doubtful (which he therein acknowledges) *Quæris enim de re, ex quâ multi dubitant; you inquire* (saith he) *of a thing wherein many doubt.* And again he writes, *Quemvis multi dubitent quomodo illinteger manet, & hoc Corpus Christi esse possit, altho' many may doubt how he can remain whole, and this be his Body and Blood, &c.*

Neither did *Bertram* cause any doubt to arise herein, to move *Paschasius* to write against him (as *Bellarmino* affirms) for *Bertram* wrote his Book at the Command of *Charles the Emperor*, who obtain'd not the Empire till the Year 875, and *Paschasius* died about the Year 851: And therefore such Writers as place *Paschasius* in the time of *Charles the Bald*, are mistaken. And had *Paschasius* wrote against *Bertram* (as *Bellarmino* affirms) he wou'd doubtless have made some mention of him in his Writings, which he has not.

The truth of the Story is, *Paschasius* was the first Writer that wrote to any purpose of Christ's Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament (we have an account of the Dotages of some others not worth mentioning). The said writings of *Paschasius* made many Mens minds doubtful, and kindled a great Fire in the Church, which made the *Emperor* (desiring to compose Differences, and to have Peace and Unity settled among his Subjects) require *Bertram* (a learned Man who liv'd in the same *Monastery* whereof *Paschasius* formerly had been *Abbot*) to deliver his Judgment touching these points.

And that *Bertram's* Book was written upon the *Emperor's* request, appears from his Declaration, Page 180. where he thus writes,

Quod in ore fidelium sumitur Corpus & Sanguis Christi querit vestra magnitudinis Excellentia, in mysterio fiat, an veritate, &c.

& utrum ipsum Corpus sit, quod de Mariâ natum est, passum, & sepultum; quodq; resurgens, & Cœlos ascendens, ad dextram Patris Consideat, &c.

Here *Bertram* tells us, that the *Emperor* desir'd to know of him, whether the *Body and Blood of Christ*, which in the *Church* is receiv'd by the *Mouth of the Faithful*; be Celebrated in a *Mystery*, or in a *Truth*; and whether it be the same *Body* that was born of the *Virgin Mary*, which did Suffer, was Dead and Bury'd; and which Rose again, and Ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the *Right Hand of God*, &c.?

To all which he Answers *Negatively*: affirming also, that the *Bread and Wine* are the *Body and Blood of our Lord Figuratively*, that they are call'd the *Lord's Body and Blood*, because they take the name of the thing of which they are a *Sacrament*: And that they are the same for *Substance* after *Consecration*, that they were before. And Page 228, thus explains himself.

Animadvertat, Clarissime Princeps, sapientia vestra, quod positus sanctarum Scripturarum Testimoniis, & sanctorum Patrum dictis; evidentissime monstratum est, quod Panis, qui Corpus Christi appellatur, figura est; quia mysterium: & quod non parva differentia est, inter Corpus, quod per mysterium existit; & quod passum est; & sepultum. Let your Wisdom, most Renown'd Prince, consider the Testimonies of the Sacred Scriptures and Sayings of holy fathers laid together, it most evidently appears; that the Bread, which is call'd the Body of Christ, is a figure, because a Mystery: and that there is no small difference betwixt the Body that exists by a mystery, and the Body that suffer'd, was buried and rose again.

The question continu'd in *Debate* for near two hundred Years after, Some maintaining the Opinion of *Bertram*, and Some that of *Paschasius*; Yet did the Opinion of *Paschasius* prevail, being Supported by *fabulous Storys* and the *Ignorance* of those Ages.

Paschasius spends a Chapter in telling Storys of *Christ's Appearances* in a *visible Shape* on the *Altar*, either in the form of a *Lamb* or in the *Colour of Flesh and Blood*: That whilst the *Host* was a *breaking or offering*, a *Lamb* was seen in the *Priest's hands*, and *Blood* in the *Chalice*. But especially he insists on a Story, how an *Angel* shew'd *Christ* to one *Plegillus* a *Priest* in the form of a *Child*, upon the *Altar*; whom he first took into his *Arms and kissed*; and afterwards eat him

him being return'd to his former Shape. On this Story *Be-rengarius* has this Jest; *Plegillus* (saith he) therein acted the part of a Knave; *Speciosa certè pars Nebilonis, ut cui Oris præ-buerat basium; dentium inferret exitiũm*: It was a proper part of a Knave; that whom he had kiss't with his mouth, he wou'd devour with his Teeth.

Joannes Diaconus tells a Story (which he had out of the English Legends) of a Roman Matron, who found a piece of Sacramental Bread, turn'd into the fashion of a finger all bloody, which afterwards on the prayer of St. Gregory was turn'd into it's former shape.

Simeon Metaphrastes tells a Story of a little Child that was seen on the Altar, and an Angel cutting him in small pieces; while the Priest was breaking the Bread into little Parts.

Amphilocius tells a Story of a certain Jew who receiving the Sacrament at St. Basil's hands for the resolution of his doubts, it converted visibly into *Flesh* and *Blood*.

These two last Storys were from these Authors convey'd to the *Latins*, and Registred in a Book call'd *Vitas Patrum*, commonly believed to have been collected out of St. Jerome, and usually read in every Monastery, which occasion'd the spreading of this Doctrine of the Corporal Presence.

These Story's were only fitted for that Age wherein the Body of Christ was held by the Roman Church to be broken by the hands of the Priest, and torn by the teeth of the faithful: And are not consistent with their present Doctrine, that the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is *Invisible* and *Indivisible* (not to be seen, felt, tasted or touch'd) and therefore these and other such like Storys of Christ's appearance in the Sacrament, must be accounted by themselves meer Deceits and Illusions; and only (as I have said) fitted for those times, wherein the Oral Manducation of Christ's Body, and guttural drinking his Blood obtain'd the general Belief.

And tho' some of 'em shou'd be true, (of which there is not the least probability) yet are we commanded not to believe any Doctrine contrary to what Christ and his Apostles have taught tho' it shou'd be confirm'd by the miraculous Publication of an Angel from Heaven.

And when Men will be forging Miracles to seduce the Simple, why may not God suffer a miracle to be wrought for their delusion, who by counterfeit miracles have endeavour'd to delude others?

By means of these *fabulous Storys* the Opinion of *Paschajus* did spread, and about the end of the *tenth Century*, got the upper hand, at which time *Berengarius* was forc'd to make that aforesaid Confession, *that the Body of Christ was broken by the hands of the Priest, and torn with the teeth of the faithful.*

Yet as to *England*, this Opinion prevail'd not till after the *Norman conquest* which is evident from a *Paschal Homily* written in *Saxon English* by *Aelfrick Abbot of Malmsbury*: (a great part whereof is *Bertram's* book translated into *Saxon English*) which by *publick Authority* was read throughout the whole Kingdom on *Easter Day*, a part of which *Homily* declares as followeth.

“ The Bread and Wine which by the Priest's Ministry
 “ is hallowed, shew one thing without, to Men's Senses;
 “ and another thing within, to believing Minds: without,
 “ they be seen Bread and Wine, both in figure and taste;
 “ and they be truly Christ's Body and Blood by Spiritual
 “ Mystery. Much is betwixt the Body Christ suffer'd in,
 “ and the Body that is hallowed to *Housel*; the Body tru-
 “ ly that Christ suffer'd in was born of the Virgin Mary,
 “ with Blood and Bones, with Skin and with Sinews, in
 “ human Limbs, with a reasonable Soul living; And his
 “ Spiritual Body which we call *Housel*, is gather'd of ma-
 “ ny Corns without Blood and Bone, without Limb,
 “ without Soul, and therefore nothing to be understood
 “ therein bodily, but Spiritually. Much to this purpose
 is contain'd in the said *Homily* which is to be found in the
Librarys of the *Universitys* of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*: which
Homily is an Evident Demonstration that the Doctrine of
 the *Corporal Presence* was not entertain'd in *England* during
 the time the *Saxons* reign'd.

To this *Homily* there are annex't two other writings of
 the said *Aelfrick*, the one directed to *Wolffstine Bishop* of
Sherborn, the other to *Wolffstane Archbishop* of *York*.

In the former he tells us the *Housel* is *Christ's Body*, not
Bodily but *Spiritually*; not the *Body* which he suffer'd in, but
 the *Body* of which he *Spake*, when he blessed Bread and Wine
 to *Housel*, the night before his suffering, and said by the Blessed
 Bread, *This is my Body*, and again of the holy Wine, *This is*
my Blood, which is shed for many in forgiveness of Sins.

In the Other, directed to *Wolffstane, Archbishop* of *York*;
 he.

Progress of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, &c. 89

he writes thus: *The Lord, which hallowed Housel, before his sufferings, and saith, that the Bread was his own Body, and that the Wine was truly his Blood, halloweth daily, by the hands of the Priest; Bread, to be his Body, and Wine, to be his Blood, in Spiritual mystery, as we read in Books. Yet notwithstanding, that lively Bread, is not Bodily so, nor the Same Body Christ suffer'd in: nor that holy Wine, is the Saviour's Blood, that was shed for us in bodily thing, but in Spiritual mystery.*

The Sum of these writings was by the Bishops at their Synods deliver'd to their Clergy to be read to the People. And this was the Doctrine of the Church of England before the Norman Conquest, at which time, or in the beginning whereof, Lanfrank being made Archbishop of Canterbury, impos'd on that Church the Doctrine of the Corporal Presence, and of the oral Manducation of Christ's Body, and guttural drinking of Christ's Blood, according to the Declaration of the Council held under Pope Nicholas II, which was the Doctrine of the Roman Church, until a Council held under Pope Gregory VII. became sensible of it's Absurdity; and then it began to be exploded, and accounted as bad as Heresy: And the figment of an Invisible and Indivisible presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament set up in it's place, which was confirm'd by the Lateran Council held under Pope Innocent III. Anno Dom. 1215. So that from breaking Christ's Body by the hands of the Priest, and tearing Christ's flesh with the Teeth of the faithful (being the Doctrine of the Roman Church about three hundred years) that Council enjoyn'd Christians to believe, that the Natural Body of Christ in the Sacrament cou'd nether be felt with hands, nor touch't with Teeth: yet eaten in the Sacrament in such a manner, as is not only absurd but utterly Inconceivable, (as hath been shewn).

It can't but be suppos'd, that much Contention shou'd hereon happen, and multitudes of disputes shou'd hence Arise in the Christian Church: which accordingly did in the several ages since, to the great disturbance of the Peace of Christendom, and effusion of much Christian Blood. Fire and Faggot consuming all that dust publickly appear in defence of Truth:

As for those that wou'd consult the Judgment of Antiquity in this important Article, I must refer 'em to the Writers of Controversy on each side. Or if they wou'd read an impartial Historian in reference to this Point, I cannot

70 *An Historical Account of the Beginning, and*
cannot commend 'em to a better then Monsieur L'arroque
in his admirable *History of the Eucharist*.

I shall conclude this *Discourse* with congratulating the
Happiness of the Reformed Churches, where such impor-
tant Articles as these may be freely debated on either side
without the Danger of an *Inquisition-Tribunal*. And in-
deed without the dread of that, so great a part of the Chri-
stian World cou'd never have been so long frightened out
of their *Senses* and *Reason* as well as out of their *Bibles*, in so
plain a Case as this. I cannot indeed but pity the genera-
lity of those of the *Romish Persuasion* who are by implicit
Faith abandon'd to so gross Delusions. And am ready to
entertain as charitable thoughts towards 'em as their Case
will admit. And I cannot but hope that some of 'em, may
seriously peruse what I have written; and if they do so, it
may by the blessing of God be effectual to convince 'em,
That *Transubstantiation* is so far from being any Doctrine
of the *Christian Religion*, that it both *overturns* all the *Evi-*
dences we have of the *Truth* of it, and is by it's innumera-
ble *Absurditys* the greatest *Reproach* imaginable to *Christia-*
nity and it's blessed *Author*, and the most fatal *stumbling-block*
to the *Infidel World* by advancing a *Waser* to be the Object
of *Di* *Adoration*.

FINIS.



SECOND
DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Invocation of *Angels* and *Saints*,

As Taught and Practis'd in the *Romish Church*.

SECOND

DISCOURSE



Invocation of St. John

As taught and preached in the House of Commons

A
T A B L E
O F T H E
C H A P T E R S.

C H A P. I.

AN Introduction to the following Discourse; wherein is shew'd that praying to Saints Deceas'd was not used in the Jewish Church, nor in the Christian Church, for above three hundred Years after Christ.

C H A P. II.

Wherein is shew'd that we have no Scripture Warrant for praying to Saints deceas'd.

C H A P. III.

Wherein is shew'd the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church, relating to Prayers to Saints deceas'd.

C H A P. IV.

Containing the First Argument against praying to Saints deceas'd: Wherein is prov'd, that we can have no assurance, that Saints Deceas'd do hear the Prayers of Suppliants here on Earth.

C H A P. V.

Containing the Second Argument against praying to Saints Deceas'd: Wherein is prov'd that Saints Deceas'd are not qualify'd to present the Prayers of Sinners on Earth, to the Divine Majesty in Heaven.

A Table. &c.

C H A P. VI.

Containing a Third Argument against praying to Saints Deceas'd: Wherein is prov'd, that praying to Saints Deceas'd, according to the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church, not only Introduces Heathenism into Christianity: but puts 'em under a necessity of Worshipping and Praying to Damned Souls in Hell.

C H A P. VII.

Containing a Fourth Argument against praying to Saints Deceas'd; wherein is prov'd that none in Heaven is to be Invoked, or pray'd unto, save only God.

C H A P. VIII.

Containing a Fifth Argument against praying to Saints Deceas'd; wherein is prov'd that such as pray to Saints Deceas'd, do therein Renounce the Mediatorship of Jesus Christ.

C H A P. IX.

Containing a Sixth Argument against praying to Saints Deceas'd; wherein is prov'd, that such as pray to Saints Deceas'd are therein guilty of Idolatry.

C H A P. X.

Containing an Answer to such Scriptures, Arguments, or Reasons, as are Insisted on by the Doctors of the Roman Church, to prove the Lawfulness of giving some kind of Religious Worship to the Creature.

C H A P. XI.

Containing an Answer to such Arguments or Reasons as are Insisted on by the Doctors of the Roman Church, to prove the Lawfulness and Utility of praying to Saints Deceas'd.

C H A P.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction to the following Discourse.

Wherein is shew'd that Praying to Saints Deceas'd, was not us'd in the Jewish Church, nor in the Christian Church, for above Three Hundred Years after Christ.

BEFORE I enter upon this Controversy, about *Praying to Sains Deceas'd*; I judge it necessary that the Reader shou'd be Instructed in the following Particulars.

In the *first place*, That it is the receiv'd Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, That the Souls of the Faithful that Dy'd before *Christ's Ascension*, were shut up, as in Prison, near the Borders of Hell: (which they call *Limbus Patrum*) and consequently since they enjoy'd not the *Beatifick Vision* they were incapable of *Serving their Brethren here on Earth*. Observe. 1.

From this Doctrine it must be concluded, that before *Christ's Ascension*, there were no Prayers made to Saints departed; and therefore all Proofs for praying to Saints (made use of by the Roman Writers) fetch't out of the *Old Testament*, must be concluded to be only us'd with Intention to deceive the vulgar of their own Party, or to Intrap the Ignorant into the Belief and Practice of their Superstition: Their Teachers being fully convinc'd of their Invalidity to prove what they urg 'em for.

Hence I Conclude that we have above *Four Thousand Years* Prescription against Prayer to Saints deceas'd; and that according to the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, there was no such Practice in use among the *Jews*.

2. That it was the general Judgment of the Eminent Doctors of the *Christian Church*, that liv'd in the first three hundred Years after Christ, That the Souls of Saints departed, went not to Heaven; but were entertain'd in certain Receptacles

The Introduction

4

cles, where they Enjoy'd the Communication of *A gels*: But till the Day of Judgment were not to be admitted to Enjoy the *Beatifick Vision*, and consequently were not capable of serving their Brethren here on Earth; upon which Capacity Prayer to Saints is founded, and upon which Opinion such Prayer for the Dead as was us'd in the Primitive Church, was founded.

Lib. Sinc.
Anot. 345.

Sixtus Senensis tells us *St. Bernard* was of this Opinion, and excuses his Error therein, because he was led there-to thro' the Opinion of many Ancient Fathers and Doctors. And names *St. James the Apostle*, *Irenæus*, *Clement*, *Romanus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Victorinus*, *Prudentius*, *St. Chrysostome*, *Arctus*, *Euthimius*, *St. Austin*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, and *Theophilact*, most of which he saith positively were of this Opinion. Of others he saith [*visi sunt*,] they seem to be of it.

in Part. 2. di-
rec. iniquil.
Comment. 21:

And *Franciscus Pegna* names others besides that were of this Opinion, as *Origen*, *Lactantius*, *St. Ambrose*, and quotes *Medina*, *Castrus* and *Scotus* for his Authors. Of this Opinion was Pope *John XXII*, who did not only teach it, but Commanded it to be held by all (as Pope *Adrian* informs in *Libro quarto Sententiarum*).

Defens. Ecclef.
Author contra
Whitakerum.

And *Thomas Stapleton* tells us, that before the *Florentine Council*, it was never defin'd as an Article of Faith, that the Souls of the Righteous enjoy the sight of God before the day of Judgment: And that it was then done, *magna demum conquisitione*.

From hence Observe 1. That Authoritys of Fathers are no sufficient ground to sway Men's Belief and Practice unless back't by Scripture. This is a great and uncomfortable Error, which was, doubtless, embrac'd by many of 'em.

2. Observe, that such as entertain'd this Error, cou'd not be of opinion, That Saints ought to be Invoked or prayed to, because Invocation of Saints must suppose a firm belief that Saints Enjoy the Beatifick vision, and thereby are capable to aid and help Suppliants here on Earth. Now it being the Opinion of the most eminent Fathers and Doctors of the Christian Church, for the first three hundred Years after Christ that the Souls of Saints deceas'd enjoy'd not the Beatifick vision before the Day of judgment: it must be consequently their Opinion, that deceas'd Saints were not to be Invoked or pray'd to And therefore there cou'd be no such Doctrine taught, or practice

practice us'd in the Christian Church, as praying to Saints deceas'd the First three hundred Years after Christ. Wherefore such Quotations out of the Fathers, as the Roman Writers on this Subject stuff their Books withal, must be Accounted *Spurious*.

And its matter of admiration, (were any thing they do for the advancement of their cause to be admir'd at) to see their Books fill'd with quotations out of Fathers, even such quotations as are by *Bellarmino* prov'd to be written by *Upstarts*, and not by the Persons whose Names they bear. A multitude of such like you may find in your Country. Man the *Jesuit Malone* against *Bishop Usher*: which makes it evident that there is little of Ingenuity in their writings. But if they can catch the Fish, they care not, whether they bait the Hook with truth or falsehood. I cou'd number above a hundred Quotations of Fathers in the *Jesuit Malone's* answer to our *Primate Usher*, rejected by *Bellarmino* as *Spurious*.

Bellarmino
de Scriptori-
bus Ecclesia-
sticis.

The only way to be even with 'em, is to take as little notice of their Quotations out of the Fathers, as they take of ours.

If they be urg'd by us against them; Then the Fathers are but *fallible Men*, and the Authority of one *Infallible Pope*, is to be esteem'd above 'em all. When they urg 'em against us, they make 'em their *Goliaths* to fight their Battles; and make 'em speak what they never thought, and what, if living, they wou'd be griev'd to hear.

The first expression that looks like an Invocation or Praying to Saints, that is to be found in any Approv'd Author, is that of *Gregory Nazianzene* in the end of his *Funeral Oration* on his Sister *Gorgonia*; where in a Rhetorical manner he thus breaks forth, *And if thou hast any care of things done by us, and holy Souls receive this honour from God as to know the Affairs of Men on Earth &c.* He speaks *Conditionally*, and with much uncertainty whether deceased Souls receive this favour from God, or no; as to have a fellow feeling of their Brethrens necessities on Earth: and this Author lived above three hundred and Sixty Years after Christ. Which plainly shews (whatever Conjectures there might have been) that there was no such Doctrine taught in his Days, that *Saints deceas'd were to be Invoked or Prayed to*. Nor is it to be doubted, but if there had been any such Do-
ctrine

ctrine taught, or practice us'd by the Primitive Christians: the *Heathen Writers*, that wrote against 'em, wou'd have charg'd 'em with it. The *Christian Writers* charge the *Heathens* with *Idolatry* for praying to their *Dæmons*: Now had the *Primitive Christians* prayed to *deceas'd Saints*, they had given the *Heathen Writers* sufficient ground, to charge them with the same *Idolatrous Practices* they charg'd the *Heathens* with.

Celsus objects against *Origen* that Christians held not to their own Rules of *worshipping God alone*, because they *worshipped Christ*. Had there been any such Practice us'd among 'em, as *praying to Saints deceas'd*, no doubt *Celsus* had charg'd 'em with it.

C H A P. II.

Wherein is shew'd that we have no Scripture warrant for Praying to Saints Deceased.

IN the *First place*, That from the *Old Testament* we have no Warrant to pray to any *deceas'd Saint*, The *Roman Church* must acknowledge (according to the Principles of their own Doctrine) who teach, that such *Saints as deceas'd before Christ's Ascension*, remained near the *Confines of Hell*, which they call *Limbus Patrum*: And because they went not to *Heaven*, they were incapable of serving their Brethren here on *Earth*; and therefore were not to be pray'd to. Hence it follows that for the *First Four thousand Years* (according to the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*) there was not any such Doctrine taught nor practice us'd in the Church of God, as *praying to Saints Deceas'd*. And therefore the *Jesuit Malone's* Argument for *praying to Saints* taken out of *Job 5. 1. v.* discovers not only much *weakness*, but also much *disingenuity* in him. *Eliphaz* in the *Fourth Chapter*, having Charg'd *Job* with *Hypocrisy*, and want of *Piety*; because God had made him so signal an example of his Judgments, tells him in the *Fifth Chapter*, verse the *First*, that *there is no Saint he can turn to*, that ever was so afflicted as God had afflicted him.

And

And to which of all the Saints wilt thou Turn? that is, thou canst not find a *President* among the Saints, whose condition will parallel thine. What then dos this Text make for praying to any Saint deceas'd? And this Learned Men of the Roman Church well know. It being Inconsistent with their own Doctrine it shou'd be understood in that Sense whereto many of their Writers do apply it, to deceive the Vulgar, and Unlearned.

Most Certain it is, that the Church of the Jews did not *Invoke any Saint deceas'd*, although they believed 'em to be in a State of *Bliss* and *perfect Happiness*. And had they not believed that the Sole Creator of Heaven and Earth, was the only Sovereign, to whom their *Homage* of Prayer was Due, they had been as busy as any *Romanist*, or *Heathen* ever was in placing of *Altars* nigh to God's *Altar*. There was no People in the World that had a greater Veneration and Dread for the Divine Majesty, than they had; and wou'd have been more forward to have made use of *Mediators*: And therefore we find 'em to Intreat *Moses*, to be a *Mediator* between God and Them. Which Practice they wou'd not have omitted after his Death, had they Judg'd the One as Lawful as the Other. And there was much more Reason to require the help and aid of *Saints* before Christ's Ascension, then there can be suppos'd to have been Since, because he is therefore *ascended into Heaven to make Intercession* for Penitent Sinners here on Earth.

Nor is there any footsteps for praying to *Saints deceas'd*, to be found in the *New Testament*. Some Ignorant Writers among the Papists wou'd ground Praying to *Saints deceas'd* from the Rich-Man's praying to Abraham to have mercy on him, and to send Lazarus to dip the tip of his Finger in water to cool his Tongue, Luke. 16. 24 v. But what Ground can there be from thence to conclude, that Sinners here on Earth, may lawfully supplicate Abraham for Mercy? It's generally acknowledg'd, that this was on'y a *Parable*, and that Christ's intent therein was only to acquaint us that there is an *After-State of Misery and Happiness*. The Roman Church do not believe that *Souls in Hell* are capable of Mercy; or that they make any Supplication for mercy to any Saint in Heaven. To urge therefore this Text to any such purposes proves nothing but the Ignorance of him that offers so weak an Argument.

I know but *one Text* out of the *New Testament* insisted on by *Roman Catholick Writers*, to countenance their Doctrine of praying to Saints Deceas'd, viz. 2. Peter. 1. 15. v. the meaning of which Text is evidently no more, but that St. Peter, while he was alive, would endeavour so to Inculcate things upon 'em (as *Masters* do to *Scholars* by oft Repetition of 'em) that they should be able after his Decease to have these things always in Remembrance.

1 Tim. 2.
Disput. 8.

A'phon'us Salméron (a Learned Jesuit) confesses that the Scriptures of the *New Testament* make no mention of Praying to Saints Deceased: And gives the Reason why, because, saith he, it would be a hard matter to have enjoyn'd this to the Jews; and to the Gentiles an occasion would thereby have been given to think, that many Gods were put upon 'em, instead of the multitude of false Gods they had forsaken.

Here we have a most ingenuous and plain Confession of a learned Jesuit, that Invocation of Saints deceas'd smelt so strongly of Idolatry, that it was not fit to be mention'd in Scripture, because of the offence both Jews and Gentiles would take thereat. And therefore tell us, it was founded on a tacit suggestion of the Spirit, and left only as a Tradition from the Apostles to be Communicated to the Church.

That it was no Apostolical Tradition has been shew'd in the former Chapter, as being inconsistent with the opinion of the most eminent Doctors and Fathers of the Primitive Church, relating to the Souls of Saints Deceased (for the first three Hundred Years after Christ and upwards). It was brought into the Church by degrees, not by any tacit suggestion of God's Spirit, but by those seducing Spirits which the Spirit of God foretold many should give ear to, teaching Doctrines concerning Demons or Souls departed, which our English Translation renders, Doctrines of Devils, 1 Tim. 4. 4. v. of which more hereafter.

C H A P. III.

Wherein is shew'd the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church, relating to Prayer to Saints deceased.

Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences, tells us, that we are to pray to Saints that they may intercede for us, that is, that by their Merits they may help us. Sentent. Lib. 4. Dist. 45.

Johannes Duns Scotus teaches, That it's a thing fitting, that the Saint that is in blis shou'd be a Coadjutor of God, in procuring the salvation of the Elect. And to this purpose it is requisite, that our Prayers which are offer'd to him, shou'd be specially reveal'd to him; because they lean upon the merits of him as a Mediator; bringing us to the salvation that is sought for. in Lib. 4. Sentent. Distin. 45. Ques. 4.

Bellarmino tells us, that in the Roman Church, Invocation is attributed to Saints as an eminent kind of Worship. Præfat. in controvers. de Eccles. Triumph. in Ord. Disp.

It wou'd amaze a Christian to read the mad Extravagancys, and horrible Blasphemies that are to be found in Books written by St. Bernardinus Senensis, St. Bernardinus de Bustis, Gabriel Biel, Jacobus de Valentiâ, Petrus Damiani, and other Popish Writers. As also in the Crown and Psalter of our Lady, in use in Italy, and other Popish Countrys, written by Cardinal Bonaventure, and Printed by the command of Pope Sixtus V. One of the Orisons prescribed in the Crown is, "O Empress, and our most kind Lady, by the Authority of a Mother, command thy most beloved Son, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that he wou'd vouchsafe to lift our Minds from our Love of Earthly, to Heavenly things."

The Psalms of his Psalter begin as David's do, wherein he makes use of all such Expressions, as David makes use of in magnifying the Power, Mercy and Goodness of God; in magnifying the Power, Goodness and Mercy of the Virgin Mary: Much of which you may find set forth, in our Learned Primate Ushers Answer to the Jesuit Malone.

I believe the Roman Catholicks of this Kingdom of Ireland, (whom I esteem to be the most Religious, and best humor'd of any Roman Catholicks in the World) will say, that

that *these are only the Luxuriances of Private Fancys, and not the Doctrine of the Roman Church, which ought to be taken out of her Decrees.*

Reply.

To whom I Reply, That the *Authors* of these *Blasphemys* are Men of greatest *Renown* in the *Roman Church*, such as have enjoy'd the greatest *Honours*, that *Church* cou'd afford; their *Books* several times Printed with *Publick Licence*, and their *Persons Registered* among their *Saints*: And therefore their *Doctrines* are justly Chargeable on the *Roman Church*. It's well known that there are many *Doctrines* and *Practices* allow'd by the *Roman Church*, which they think not fit to be decreed in *Councils*: But when *Doctrines* are taught by eminent Men, and of greatest *Authority* in a *Church*, and upon their account had in *Reputation*, believ'd and practic'd by the generality of it's Members; And such *Councils* as have succeeded the Teachers of such *Doctrines*, having had opportunity to Declare against 'em, yet have not done it; but by doubtful expressions have left ground enough for the Continuance of such *Doctrines*: It's but a vain Allegation to say, the *Roman Church* is not chargeable with 'em, because not to be found in the *Decrees* of it's *Councils*.

It's well known, that the *Popes* of *Rome* have assum'd to themselves the *Explication* of the *Decrees* of their *Councils*, wherefore such *Doctrines*, as have always Receiv'd their *Countenance* and *Approbation* are to be accounted the meaning of the said *Decrees* relating to such *Doctrines*.

But there is sufficient matter out of the *Decrees* of the *Roman Church*, wherewith to Charge them as to this particular.

Tit. de Sanct.

The *Roman Catechism* made by the Decree of the *Council of Trent*, and Published by the *Pope's* Command, teaches that *Saints* are to be prayed to; because they Continually make *Prayers* for the health of *Mankind*, and God gives us many benefits by their *Merit* and *Favour*: and that it is lawful to have recourse to the *Favour* or *Grace* of the *Saints*, and to use their help and aid.

There are two Things I wou'd have hence observ'd, 1. This *Catechism* teaches, That the Benefits which we receive from God, we receive by the *Merit* and *Favour* of the *Saints*. 2. That it's not only good to pray to 'em, but to pray to 'em for their help and aid.

Answerable

It
the
Com
I
Ear
nee
care
save
ever
A
Sen
ly to
Sain
muc
no l
F
that
our
A
ackn
of t
it's
Bless
our
bein
can
Lea
no v
3.
wha
eth
Abr.
whi
decl
ent
Liv

It is not necessary to the happiness of the Saints, that they shou'd know *Terrestrial Affairs*: Their happiness is Compleat in seeing God.

It is not necessary to the happiness of the Sinner here on Earth, that the Saints in Glory shou'd hear his Prayers: He needs not their Intercession in the least. He has an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous: who is able to save to the uttermost all such as come to God by him; seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for 'em.

And for this Reason, Peter Lombard (Master of the Sentences) thought it not prudent to go higher, then on-ly to affirm, that it is not Incredible that the Souls of the Saints do understand the things that are done abroad, as much as appertains to them for Joy, and to us for help, which no Learned Protestant ever yet deny'd.

Joannes Duns Scotus says no more, but that it's probable that God doth reveal to the Saint in Blessedness, such of our Prayers as are offered to him, or to God in his Name.

And Gabriel Biel (in his Lecture on the Canon of the Mass) acknowledges, that it's no part of the Essential Blessedness of the Saints, to know our Prayers here on Earth; and that it's uncertain, whether it Appertains to their Accidental Blessedness: And concludes it's only probable that they hear our Prayers: So that Possibility, or at most Probability of being heard by Saints in Heaven, is all the Ground we can have for praying to 'em, by the Confession of the most Learned Men of the Roman Church: On which account no wise Man did ever yet petition a Mortal Man.

3. The Scripture tells us, That Saints are ignorant of what is done on Earth, his Sons come to honour and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not. Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel knoweth us not. Upon which Text Anselmus Landunensis (in his Interlineal Gloss) declares it to have been the Opinion of some of the Ancient Fathers, that the Saints in Heaven know not what the Living on Earth do; no, not what their own Sons do.

C H A P. V.

Containing the Second Argument against Praying to Saints Deceased: wherein is prov'd that Saints Deceased, are not qualify'd to present the Prayers of Sinners on Earth to the Divine Majesty in Heaven.

IF the *Saints in Heaven* are not *qualify'd* to present the *Prayers and Supplications of Sinners on Earth*, to the *Divine Majesty*; they are not to be *Prayed or Addressed* to, not so much as to *Attorneys or Advocates*, to carry our *Suits to God*: For unless they are *qualify'd*, they ought not, they dare not, present them to the *Divine Majesty*. Now none can be hereto *qualify'd*, but such as know whether our *prayers* are *fit* to be *Accepted* of the *Divine Majesty*, which none in *Heaven* can know, save only *God*, and *Christ as God*: None, I say, in *Heaven*, can know whether our *prayers* are *fit* to be *Accepted*, save only he whose prerogative it is to know the *Secrets of our Hearts*, and *Dispositions of our Souls*. The pouring out good words, with *External Sighs*, and *Groans*, are but the *Carcass of Prayer*: the *Life* thereof consists in sending up those *Secret Groans of the Spirit* that cannot be uttered.

Now forasmuch as no *Saint or Angel in Heaven* knows the *Sincerity of my Heart*, the *Inward frame and Disposition of my Soul* (and consequently whether my *Prayers* are *fit* to be *accepted of God*). No *Saint or Angel* can be *qualified* to present my *Prayers* to *God*. He only whose *Pre-*

rogative it is to know the *Hearts of the Children of Men*, that knoweth what is the *Mind of the Spirit*, is *fit* to perform this Office. And that the understanding the *Secrets of the Hearts of Men*, is reserv'd by *God* to himself (as his peculiar *Prerogative*) the *Scriptures* in the *Margin* fully prove.

And therefore *God* in his *Infinite Wisdom* provided that admirable *Mystery of the hypostatical Union of the Divine and human Nature*, in the *Person of Jesus Christ* our *Mediator*,

- 2. Chron. 6.
- 30. v. 1. Kings
- 8. 39. v. Plal.
- 7. 9. v. Matth.
- 6. 4. v. Rom.
- 8. 27. v.

Mediator, to make him qualify'd to be an *Intercessor* betwixt him and *Sinners* here on Earth,

C H A P. VI:

Containing the Third Argument against Praying to Saints Deceas'd; wherein is prov'd, That Praying to Saints Deceas'd (according to the Practice of the Roman Church) not only introduces Heathenism into Christianity, but puts 'em under a necessity of Worshipping and Praying to Damn'd Souls in Hell.

THAT Prayer to Saints as practis'd in the Roman Church, puts it's Members under a necessity of Praying to Damn'd Souls in Hell, will appear, if we consider, that there are multitudes of *Notorious Hypocrites* that are *Canoniz'd* and Pray'd to in the Roman Church. Money has made many a Saint at Rome: And *Hypocrites* are of all Men the most solicitous in getting the name and credit of *Saints*. Whereas the truly Pious endeavour to approve themselves to be so only to God; concealing as much as they are able their Piety from the Eyes of Men. It's a thing well known, that *Cities* and *Corporations* have given considerable Sums of Money to get some of their Members *Canoniz'd*, by reason of the credit and benefits they reap thereby. And *History* informs us of many, that for committing great Villanies have been *Canoniz'd at Rome*; as also, that some have been *Canoniz'd*, and after taken up and burnt for *Hereticks*.

Cardinal Bellarmine complain'd (as *Bodin* informs us) that In Method. many were *Canoniz'd* whose lives he cou'd not approve of, Hist. Lib. 4. and such concerning whom they knew nothing but from their Parties, and pretended *Visions* and *Revelations* made to *Hypocondriacal Persons*, such as *St. Fingare*, *St. Anthony of Padua*, *Charles Borromew*, *Ignatius Loyola*, *St. Christopher*, *St. George*. There are in some of their Ancient Litanies, an *Ora pro nobis* to *St. Faith*, *St. Hope*, *St. Charity*, all three Daughters of *St. Sapientia*.

Among the Devouter Romanists, every City has its Saint, every Family its Saint; every Devouter Person chuses his

Patron Saint; whose *Festivals* they solemnly observe, to whose *Altars* they frequently resort, whose *Images* they most Religiously worship, and to whose *Honour* they say many a *Pater Noster*. Every *Trade* has a particular *Saint*, yea, the very *Harlots* (because a *Trade at Rome*) seek *Patronage* from *St. Aja* and from *St. Mary Magdalene*. There are also particular *Saints* whom the *Devouter Romanists* do invoke for the *Cure* of all kind of *Diseases*; as *St. Sebastian* and *St. Roch* for the *Cure* of the *Plague*, *St. Petronilla* to *Cure* the *Feavor*; *St. John* and *St. Bennet* the *Abbot* to *Cure* all *Poyson*, *St. Appollonia* to *Cure* the *Tooth-Ach*, and *St. Ostilia* to *Cure* sore *Eyes*, *St. Apollinaris* to *Cure* the *French-Pox*, *St. Liberius* to *Cure* the *Stone*: And if the teeming *Mother* will have a lovely *Boy*, she must *Pray* to *St. Felicitas*.

There are also particular *Saints*, to whom the *Devouter Romanists* apply themselves for the *Cure* of their *Cattle*: as to *St. Gall* for the fruitfulness of their *Geese*, to *St. Mendaline* for their *Sheep*, to *St. Anthony* for their *Hogs*, to *St. Pelagius* for their *Oxen*. From which Practices it is evident, that this *Doctrine of Praying to Saints* (as practic'd in the *Roman Church*) not only introduces *Heathenism* into *Christianity*, but also puts 'em under a necessity of *Worshipping* and *Praying to Damn'd Souls in Hell*.

C H A P. VII.

Containing the Fourth Reason or Argument against Praying to Saints Deceased: Wherein is prov'd, that none in Heaven is to be Invoked or Prayed to, save only GOD.

THAT we have no warrant from Scripture to Pray to any Saint deceas'd, has been shewn. See Chap. II. I shall now prove, *That none in Heaven is to be invocated save only God.*

The *Apostle* tells us, *Rom. 10. 14 v.* That we are to *Pray* to none in *Heaven*, but to him, in whom we believe: *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?* in the 13 v. he tells us, that *whosoever shall call on the name of the*

the Lord shall be saved; that is, sincerely *Pray to God*: And in the next Verse concludes, we cannot *Pray to God* unless we believe in him; *How shall they call on him in whom they believe not?* Hence I conclude, That none can be the *Object* of our *Prayers*, that are not the *Objects* of our *Faith*. If therefore *deceased Saints* are not the *Objects* of our *Faith*, they ought not to be the *Objects* of our *Prayers*. If they are not to be *believed in*, they are not to be *Prayed to*.

And this will further appear if we Consider, That Prayer implies and includes a *Trust*, *Confidence*, *Dependance* and *Subjection* in, on, and to the *Person we Pray to*, which is the Sum of what *Faith* or *Believing* do's import. If therefore I can't *Pray to deceased Saints* without placing *Trust*, *Confidence* and *Affiance* in them, I can't *Pray to 'em* without *Believing in 'em*. We may love the *Saints in Heaven* without *believing in 'em*; but we can't *Pray to 'em* without *Trust*, *Reliance* and *Dependance* on 'em, without *Affiance* and *Confidence* in 'em; which is the same with *Faith* or *Believing*.

Now forasmuch as none in Heaven is to be *believ'd in* save *God alone*, none in Heaven but *God alone* (the *Lord Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*) is to be *prayed to*.

That it was the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers, that none in Heaven was to be *Invoked* or *Pray'd to* save only *God*, appears in this, because it was their great Argument against the *Arians* to prove *Christ* to be *God*, because he was *invoked* or *prayed to*.

Athanasius proves *Christ* to be *God*, because *St. Paul* hath said 1. *Theff. 3. 11. v. God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you.* "No Man (saith he) would pray to receive any thing from the Angels, or from any other Creature: neither would any say, God, and the Angels give thee this, or that.

Orat. 4. cont.
Arianos.

And whereas it might be objected, that *Jacob* in the *Blessing* he gave to *Ephraim* and *Mannasses*, did joyn an *Angel* with *God*, he tells us, That "He did not couple one of the Created Angels with *God*; but that it was the Word of *God*, that is to say, the Son of *God* (the Angel of the Covenant) that he coupled with the Father. By the way take notice, that *Athanasius* proves *Christ* to be *God*, because he was *Pray'd to*, and coupled with *God*: Surely had he now been living, he would have condemn'd the

De Trinitate
Cap. 14.

In Epist. ad
Roma. Lib. 8.
Cap. 10.

Practice of the *Roman Church*, who joyn *Saints* and the *Virgin Mary* with *God*, and *Christ*, in their *Oaths*, *Benedictions*, *Salutations*, *Wishes*, and *Prayers*, they make each for other. "If *Christ* (saith *Novatianus*) be only *Man*, why is he call'd upon? seeing Invocation of man is of no force to yield *Salvation*. If *Christ* be only *Man*, why is there Hope reposed in him, seeing Hope in *Man* is said to be cursed?

"Forasmuch (saith *Origen*) as *St. Paul* hath said 1. Cor. 1. 2. v. with all that call upon the Name of *Jesus Christ* our Lord, both theirs and ours; he doth pronounce thereby, *Jesus Christ* (whose Name is call'd upon) to be God. Forasmuch as to call upon the Name of the Lord, and to adore *God* are all one.

Ignatius in his *Epistle* to the *Philadelphians*, gives advice to *Virgins*, that in their *Prayers*, they shou'd have *Christ alone*, and his *Father* before their *Eyes*.

Tertullian and *St. Cyprian* in their Books which they purposely writ concerning *Prayer*, teach us to regulate our *Prayers* according to that perfect Pattern, prescrib'd by our Lord, *Matth. 6. 9. v.* wherein we are taught, to direct our *Prayers* only to *God*.

In the *Definition* of *Prayer* given by the *Fathers*, it is defin'd with expresse reference to *God*.

Prayer (saith *Chrysostom*) is a *Colloquie* or *Discourse* with *God*. And in his *Ninth Homily* on the 3d of the *Colossians*, tells us that it was the *Devil*, who envying the honour of *Man's* immediate and free access to *God*, intic'd him to commit the felony of calling upon *Angels*.

St. Ambrose in his *Funeral Oration* on the *Emperor Theodosius*, tells us, that *God alone* is to be invocated: "Thou alone (saith he) art to be invocated, thou art requested, to supply the miss of him in his Sons.

in Prob. 2. "We ought (saith *St. Jerom*) to invoke none by praying to 'em, but *God himself*.

Cont. Celsam "We ought not (saith *Origen*) to pray to them, that
Lib. 5. p. 338. "pray for us; and tells us, That our *Prayers* are not to be
233. "offer'd up to any but *God alone*, and that all our *Inter-*

Lib. 9. p. 416. "cessions, *Supplications* and *Thanksgivings*, are to be of-
Lib. 8. p. 233. "fer'd only to *God* over all, by that *High Priest* who is
402. "greater than all the *Angels* (the *Living word* of *God*)
and that we ought only to pray to *God* over all, and
his

“ his only Son, the first-born of every Creature ; who as
 “ our High Priest, offers up our Prayers to his God and
 “ our God.

To these and many other *Testimonies*, out of the *Ancient Fathers*, The *Roman Church* give one general Answer, telling us, that they relate only to Prayer, Sovereign, Absolute, Direct, Final, Sacrificial ; which ought to be made only to God. But Prayer Subaltern, Relative, Oblique, Transfusive, and out of the Sacrifice may be made to Saints.

It was a *Question* much debated in the Kingdom of Scotland in times of Popery, whether the *Lords Prayer* might be said to Saints ; And they concluded that *Ultimate, Principaliter, Primario, & capiendo Strictè*, it was to be said to God : But *non ultimate, minus Principaliter, & Secundario & capiendo largè*, it might be said to Saints. And with such frivolous *Distinctions*, do they dishonour God, and beguile their Souls.

That Saints are directly and absolutely invocated in the *Roman Church* (that is to say) in the very same form of words, and with the same Postures of Devotion, and all Solemnitys us'd in Prayer to God, has been already shown: They pray not to 'em only as to *Attorneys* or *Advocates* to carry their suits to God ; but pray to 'em for help and aid ; to confer on 'em the Gifts and Graces they pray for : And that by their *Merits* they may obtain 'em. See Chap. 8th.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing a Fifth Argument against Praying to Saints Deceased ; wherein is prov'd that such as Pray to Deceased Saints, do therein renounce the Mediatorship of Jesus Christ.

Saint Peter tells us Acts 5, 31. v. that God had exalted the Lord Jesus Christ to be a Prince and Saviour, i. e. an Intercessor.

Saint Paul tells us Heb. 7. 25 v. that Christ is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for them. And Chapt. 9. verse 24. further tells us that he is gone to Heaven (for this very End)

to appear in the Presence of God for us. And Chap. 4. verses 14. 16. Encourages Sinners to pray to God, because Christ is gone to Heaven, And 1. Tim. 2. 5. v. tells us that there is no other Mediator, betwixt God and Man but Christ Jesus, whose Prerogative it is to intercede for Sinners to the Divine Majesty: This is an Honour and Dignity God has exalted him unto, after his sufferings, and as a Reward thereof. Wherefore to make Prayers and Supplications to the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, for aid or help; to have by their Merit, and Intercession, the gifts and graces they pray for conferr'd upon 'em; is a depriving of Christ Jesus of that Grand Dignity and Prerogative he is now in Heaven exalted to, as much as in us lies. And consequently a depriving of our selves of the Benefit of that Mediation, without which no Man can be saved. And therefore, I shou'd have admir'd that a Doctrine of such dangerous Consequence as this, shou'd ever be embrac'd by such as profess Christianity; had not the Spirit of God foretold 1. Tim. 4. 4. v. that Some shou'd depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits (i. e. seducing Men) and Doctrines of Devils, that is to say, Doctrines concerning Demons, or Souls of Famous Men departed this Life, which the Heathens call'd Demons; to whom they gave the worship of Prayer or Invocation: making 'em Intercessors to their Chief God, expecting thro' their Mediation, to receive from him the benefits they prayed for.

This Doctrine concerning Demons or Souls departed the Spirit of God did foretel, shou'd by the means of seducing Men, be received in the Christian Church; and sad experience proves the truth of the Prediction. And this is a practice deriv'd from the Heathens. 'Tis pure Gentilism Christianis'd.

There are three things (I desire the Reader to take notice of) that are taught in the Roman Church with reference to the Intercession of Saints.

1. They teach that the Intercession of the Saints themselves, is to be relied on for help and aid.
2. They teach that the Intercession of the Saints becomes valid, upon the Account of the Merits of the Saints themselves.
3. They teach that the Treasure of the Church for Indulgences, is made up of the Satisfaction of the Saints, as well as of Christ's.

Wherein

Wherein now is the Difference betwixt the *Mediation of Christ*, and *Saints*? In kind they differ not; for to the *Saints* as well as to *Christ* they ascribe *Intercession*, *Merits*, and *Satisfaction*. The Difference therefore must only consist in the *Degree*: that is to say, that *Christ* is only in a higher degree, a *Mediator* or *Intercessor*; which is, in effect a renouncing of *Christ's Mediatorship*. For as the Acknowledgment of more *Gods in Heaven* than *One* (tho' in *Subordination* to the true *God*) is an *Implicit Denial* of the *God* we pretend to own: So is the setting up of the *Mediatorship* of any *Creature* in *Heaven*, or the making any *Created* being there a *Mediator of Intercession*, (tho' in *Subordination* to *Christ*) an *implicit denial* of, and *renouncing Christ's Mediatorship*.

As there is (I say) but *one God* in *Heaven*, having no other *Gods*, in *Subordination* to him; so there is but *one Mediator* in *Heaven*, having no other *Mediators*, in *Subordination* to him. To be a *Mediator* is a *God-like Royalty*, and cannot pertain to more than *One*.

St. Paul tells us, that some, in his time, under pretence of *Humility* worshiped *Angels* which carry'd with it a shew of wisdom. They worship'd not those *Angels* as *Gods*. (As is alledg'd by the *Roman Church*) For *St. Paul* saith, that they seem'd to manifest *humility* in that kind of worship: Therefore the meaning must be, that not daring as it were to go to *God*, they made Application to *Angels* to *Intercede* for 'em. This (saith the *Apostle*) was a *specious pretext*, and seem'd to carry a great shew of *humility* in it; Yet tells us, in so doing they deny'd *Jesus Christ* to be the *Head*.

Wherefore to make any *Deceased Saint*, or *Angel* a *Mediator of Intercession*, (tho' in *Subordination* to *Christ*) expecting on their merits to have our prayers accepted of *God*, is, in effect, a *Denying Christ* to be the *Head*; and consequently a *Renouncing* his *Mediatorship*.

And therefore, when the *Invocation of Creatures* first got Entertainment in the *Church of God*; such good Men as were leaven'd with this *Doctrine*, were notwithstanding careful to preserve intire the great *Prerogative of Christ's Mediatorship*: not daring to make the least *Incroachment* on his *Meritorious Intercession*. And therefore pray'd to *Deceased Saints*, only as to *Attorneys* or *Advocates*, to carry their *Suits* to *God*, by way of *wishing* only, and not

not by solemn *Addresses on their Knees*. Wherein, tho' they Erred, (forasmuch as none in Heaven is to be *Invoked*, or *prayed to*, save God alone; (as has been proved in the former Chapter, See Argument 4th). Yet was not their *Error* nigh so dangerous, as is that of the present *Roman Church*; who not only on bended Knees, with Hands and Eyes lifted up to Heaven, in places of *Divine Worship*; and amidst their Devotions to God, (and with the same Solemnitys of Worship us'd to God) make their *Supplications* to 'em, for *help* and *aid*: but also *Invoke* them, as *Joynt Petitioners*, with *Christ*; upon whose *Merits* relying as well as on the *Merits of Christ*, they suppose God to grant such Petitions, as are made to him, on their behalf.

C H A P. IX.

Containing the Sixth and last Reason or Argument against Praying to Saints Deceased: wherein is prov'd that such as Pray to Saints Deceased, are therein guilty of Idolatry.

THe *Roman Church* do teach that a man may be guilty of *Idolatry* two manner of ways, 1. *by worshiping of false Gods*. 2. *By giving that worship to the Creature, that is due only to the True God*. Therefore, if *praying to Saints* be a *giving that worship to the Creature, that is due only to the true God*; then must such as *pray to Saints Deceased* be guilty of *Idolatry* according the *Doctrin of the Roman Church*.

The Difference betwixt the *Reformed* and *Roman Church* consists in this: They teach that there are *three kinds of Religious Worship*, which they call by the Names of *Douleia*, *Hyperdouleia*, and *Latreia*. The *first* they ascribe to *Saints Deceased*, the *Second* to the *Virgin Mary*, the *Third* to *God*. (at least that which they call *absolute Latreia*.)

The *Reformed Churches* teach, that *all Religious Worship* whatever, appertains only to *Almighty God*. And that the aforesaid *Distinctions* are but the *Inventions* of Men's Brains;

Brains; having no *Foundation* in *Scripture*: And that *Solemn Prayer* is the most eminent part of *Religious Worship*. In order therefore to prove, that *praying to Saints Deceased* is *Idolatry*, I shall lay down *two Propositions*, or *Conclusions*.

I. *That all Religious Worship whatever without Distinction, is due only to Almighty God.*

II. *That Solemn Prayer, is one of the most eminent Parts of Religious Worship.*

I begin with the *First* of these *Propositions*; in order to the Proof whereof, It is necessary that I explain what is to be understood by *Religious Worship*.

Worship is either *Civil* or *Religious*. *Civil Worship* is an *Observance*, or *Submission*, paid to *Persons*, living in the same *Civil Society* with us, upon the Account of their *Excellencys* and *Superiority* over us: which is exprest in these Kingdoms by *pulling off the Hat*, *bowing of the Head*, and *bending of the Knee*. This *Worship* is due from *Children* to their *Parents*, from *Subjects* to their *Princes*, &c. It implies *Superiority over us*, in the *Person* to whom it is due: And herein it differs from *Honour*, which is due to our *Equals* and *Inferiors*, upon the Account of their *Excellencys*. The Expressions of both in these Kingdoms are much the same; except that of *bending the Knee*, which is only due to such as have *Superiority* over us.

Whereever therefore there is *Superiority over us*, there is *Worship due*. If this *Superiority* be seated in *Persons* living in the same *Civil Society* each with other, it's call'd *Civil Worship*: But if *Worship* be paid to any out of the same *Civil Society* with us, it is *Religious Worship*; because it implies a *Superiority* in some *Person* over us, that has a *Being out of this World*. For Instance, if I *kneel* to any *Saint* or *Angel*, (because they are not Members of the same *Civil Society* with me, but have their *Being out of this World*) my *kneeling* to them is an act of *Religious Worship*, and implies a *Superiority in them over me*. In like manner, if I *bow* or *kneel* before an *Image*, (consider'd only as a *Stone*, or *Piece of Wood*. I shew my self therein to be an *Idolatrous Sot*; because I therein acknowledge *Superiority* over me, in a *Stone*, or *piece of Wood*). But if I *bow* or *kneel* before it, as it represents some *Saint* or *Angel*; then do I acknowledge that *Saint* or *Angel* whom it represents, to have *Superiority* over me: And my Act of *kneeling* or *bowing* before it, becomes *Religious Worship* to that *Saint* or *Angel* whose *Image* I *kneel* be-

fore. Therefore, forasmuch as *Worship* is founded on a *Superiority* or *Sovereignty* over us; and that there is none out of the same *Civil Society* we live in, has *Superiority* or *Sovereignty* over us, save *God alone*: We conclude, that out of this *Civil Society* we live in, none ought to be *Worship'd* by us save *God alone*. And consequently that all *Religious Worship* (let it be of what kind soever) is *Due* only to *Almighty God*.

There are six outward Acts, whereby *God* did require *Man* to *Worship* him. 1. *Sacrificing*. 2. *Burning Incense*. 3. *Erecting of Altars* or *Temples*. 4. *Vows* or *Oaths*. 5. *Adoration* or *Bodily Gestures*. 6. *Solemn Prayers*. The two first, being *Typical*, are ceased; the rest are still in force: By which Acts *God* requires us to manifest our *Subjection* to him. Wherefore, to *Pray*, to bow the *Body*, or *Kneel* to any out of the same *Civil Society* we live in, is to give those *Acknowledgments* of our *Subjection* to 'em, which *God* has requir'd to be given to himself, for a manifestation of our *Subjection* to him.

There are also many *Circumstances*, that alter that act of *Worship*, which otherwise wou'd be only *Civil*; and make it to become *Religious Worship*: as the *Time*, *Place*, *Occasion*, and the *Intention of the Person*, to whom the Act of *Worship* is given. As for instance, to kneel to my *Natural*, *Spiritual*, or *Civil Parent*, is *Lawful*; because they have a *Sovereignty* and *Superiority* over me: but if I do it in the *Church*, and in the *time of Prayer*, then it becomes an act of *Religious Worship*; because in such a *Place* and *Time* none ought to be kneeled to but *God*. To pray to my *Christian Friend*, or *Minister* to pray for me, is *Lawful*. For a *Child* to pray to his *Parent* on his bended knees, to petition *God* in his behalf, is *lawful*, and his *Duty*; but to pray to him so to do, in a *Church*, and in the *Time of Divine Service*, and amidst his *Petitions to Almighty God*, is *Idolatry*: Because in such a *place* and *time* none ought to be supplicated and pray'd to, but only *God*. To burn *Incense* is *lawful*; but to burn it in an *Idol's Temple*, or before an *Idol*, is *Idolatry*. To kneel to my *Prince* or *Parent*, is *Lawful*; but if my *Prince* or *Parent* require *Divine honours* to be given to 'em; and the outward expression thereof by kneeling, then my kneeling to either of 'em becomes *Idolatry*. And for this Reason, the *Primitive Christians* chose rather to loose their *Lives*, then to give to the *Heathen Emperors* the same outward Acts

Acts of Worship, they gave to *Christian Emperors*: Because they requir'd them as manifestation of those *divine honours*, they claimed to be due to 'em.

Thus having shew'd the Difference betwixt *Civil* and *Religious Worship*, I proceed to prove my first Proposition viz. *that all kind, or manner of Religious Worship, is Due Only to Almighty God.*

And this I prove from the words of Christ, Mat. 4. 10. *thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

The Question in Debate betwixt the *Reformed* and *Roman Church* relating to this text is, whether the restrictive Particle *Only* in this text, relates to the Word *Worship*, or only to the word *Serve*? *They say* it relates only to the word *Serve*; *we say* it relates to *both*.

I shall therefore from this text prove *two things*,

1. That the Restrictive Particle *Only* in this text, has Relation to the word (*Worship*) as well as to the word *Serve*.
2. That the *Worship* the Devil desir'd from Christ, and which Christ tells him, was due only to *Almighty God*, was not the *highest kind* of *Religious Worship*, which the *Roman Church* call by the name of *Latreia*: but only an *Inferior* sort of *Worship*, which they call by the name of *Douleia*.

In the *first Place*, That the restrictive particle *Only* has relation not only to the word *Serve*; but also to the word *Worship*; appears from the Request the Devil made to Christ: *All this will I give thee* (saith the Devil) *if thou wilt fall down and Worship me.* The Devil did not request Christ to *serve* him, but only to *worship* him; which Christ tells him was *unlawful*. And why *unlawful*? because, says Christ, *it is written thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Now if this text did Import no more, save that *God alone* was to be *served*; and not only to be *Worship'd*: it had been urg'd by Christ, to no purpose against the Devil; because not urg'd, to prove the *unlawfulness* of doing, what the Devil Requested him to do, which was only to *Worship* him. The Devil did not desire *Service* from Christ, but only *Worship*: Wherefore it must be Accounted a most pitiful evasion of the force of this text, to say (as the *Roman Doctors* do) that it only forbids *service*, (that is to say an *Inward Submission of the mind*) to be given to any but *God* but forbids not *Worship*. Had the Devil understood this Text in that *Jesuitical sense*, he wou'd have answer'd Christ, by telling him,

him, that text made nothing against what he desir'd of him, that he only desir'd an *Outward Act of Worship*, and that text forbad only *service, or an Inward submission of the mind* to be given to any but God; which he desir'd not from him: It was only an act of *Adoration, or falling down before him*, that he requested from him. The Devil is, questionless, as cunning a *Sophister* as any *Jesuit* in Christendom, and wou'd have thus replyd, had he not understood the Scripture better than they seem to do: and consequently knew that this text did forbid all *Religious Worship*, as well as *Service*, to be given to any save Almighty God. And if the Devil from this Text was so far convinc'd *That all Religious Worship was due only to Almighty God*, as to think fit not to urge it farther, he must in this point be more *Impudent* than the Devil that will not be silenced by it.

In the *Second Place*, that the *Worship* the Devil desir'd from Christ, and which Christ ascribes, as due only to God; was not the *highest kind of Religious Worship*, or that *worship* which the *Roman Church* call by the Name of *Latreia* (*Consisting (as they say) in the Inward Submission of the mind than is due only to Almighty God*) is evident from the words of Christ, *thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*.

Christ do's not answer the Devil by telling of him, *thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God with the Worship of Latreia, or with the highest kind of Religious Worship*: but appropriates all *Religious worship to God* without distinction. And where neither Christ nor the Law do's distinguish, it's Presumption in Man to do it. I say Christ tells us in general Terms without distinction, that *God alone is to be Worship'd* with all that *Worship* which we call *Religious*; and not with the *Worship of Latreia* only. Nor is it Reasonable to suppose that the Devil shou'd require from Christ (whom he knew to be the *Son of God*) that *Inward Submission of the Mind*, which he knew only to be due to the True God. The Scripture makes no mention of any such Request, but only tells us, that the Devil was so Impudent, as to Desire an *outward Act of Adoration* from Christ's human nature: that is to say, that *Worship* which the *Roman Church* call by the name of *Douleia*. Which *Worship*, since our Saviour Appropriates to God, it necessarily follows that all *Religious Worship without distinction is God's Peculiar*.

Nor can Rev. 22. 9. v. be understood of the *worship of Latreia*:.

Latreia : St. John was not reprehended for giving the *Worship* of *Latreia* to the *Angel*. Nor did *Cornelius* worship St. *Peter* as believing him to be a *God*; but supposing him to be more than an *ordinary Man*, he thought some kind of *Religious Worship* might be given to him: which St. *Peter* forbids, because as by giving *Religious Worship* to *God*, we thereby acknowledge him to be *God*; So by giving it only to him, We acknowledge him to be the *one and only God*. And therefore the Scripture styles *God* a *Jealous God*; not only *Jealous* least he shou'd not be *Worshipped*, but *Jealous* least any shou'd be *worshipped besides himself*. The most Excellent Creature that ever was, or can be, must be infinitely below *God*, and therefore ought not to Participate with him in any part of *Religious Worship*. Nor had *Christ*, the *Son of God*, our Blessed Redeemer, been capable of *Religious Worship*, had he not been *God and Man* in one *Person*. Acts 10. 25 v.

And this is one of the chief Arguments insisted on, by the *Ancient Fathers* to prove *Christ* to be *God*: because *Religious Worship* was given to him.

“ *Athanasius* proves all *Religious Worship* to be due only to *God*; because, (saith he) *Peter* did forbid *Cornelius* when he wou'd have worshipped him, saying, I my self also am a *Man*. The *Angel* also did forbid *John*, when he wou'd have worshipped him, saying, see thou do it not, I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren the Prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this Book, worship *God*.

“ Wherefore, (saith this *Father*,) it appertaineth only to *God* to be worshipped, (without making any Distinctions of the kinds of worship) and this do the *Angels* themselves well know, that tho' they surpass all others in *Glory*, yet are they but *Creatures*, and in this Number, not of those that are ador'd, but of those that adore the *Lord*.

Had *Athanasius* acknowledg'd, that a *Relative Latreia*, or that *Inferior kind of Worship*, call'd *Douleia*, might be given to any *Creature*, he wou'd have distinguish'd; and not have told us, that it appertaineth only to *God* to be *Worshipp'd* and *Ador'd*. shou'd any *Roman Doctor* tell the World in his Writings, that it appertain'd only to *God* to be worshipped; and quote St. *Peters* Prohibition of *Cornelius*, and the *Angels* Prohibition of St. *John*, to prove it; and

and not make mention of what *kind of Religious Worship* he meant thereby : He wou'd be soon Censur'd by the *Roman Church* for an *Heretick*. And that *Athanasius* meant that *all Religious Worship* of what *kind soever*, did appertain *only to God*, will appear, if we Consider the Reason of his words ; which was to convince the *Arians* of *Idolatry* : who held *Christ* to be a *Creature only*, yet Notwithstanding gave *Religious Worship* to him.

The *Arians* did not give to *Christ* that *Sovereign and Absolute Worship*, which they gave to the *Father* ; but an *Inferior kind of Worship*, such as they thought might be given to the *Creature* upon the Account of *God like Excellencys*. Now had *Athanasius* concluded that *Idolatry* consisted, in giving the highest kind of *Religious Worship* to the *Creature* : He wou'd not have Charg'd the *Arians* with *Idolatry*, nor argu'd so weakly against 'em. Therefore *Athanasius* must here be understood to speak of *all religious Worship*, without Distinction.

This Argument is made Use of by *Gregory Nazianzene*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *St. Basil*, *St. Epiphanius*, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Augustin*, *Theodoret*, and others against the *Arians* ; All of these *Fathers* charging 'em with *Idolatry* in worshipping of *Christ*, supposing him to be a *Creature*. And because the *Arians* held the lawfulness of giving to *Christ* a *Relative Latreia* (inasmuch as he was the *Image of God*, and that the worship they gave him, terminated on *God the Father* thro' him) those *Fathers* dispute against 'em, and prove, That to give to *Christ* a *Relative Latreia*, is *Idolatry* ; and introduces *Heathenism*, under Pretence of *Christianity*, and that they make *Christ* an *Idol*, in case they give *divine worship* to him ; and not acknowledge him, to be of the *same nature*, and *substance*, with the *Father* : Understanding by *Divine Worship*, all kind of *Religious service*, as well the worship of *Douleia*, as that of *Latreia*.

Apol. 2.

Justin Martyr tells the *Heathen Emperors*, that *Christ* did persuade Men to *Worship God alone*, by saying, *this is the great Commandment, thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God ; and him only shalt thou Serve*. And that we are to render unto *Cesar the things that are Cesars*, and unto *God the things that are God's*. "on which Account, saith he, we worship God alone, and give cheerful Service in all things to You.

Had

Had this *Father* been of Opinion, that *some kind of Religious Worship*, might be given to the *Creature*, he wou'd have *Distinguished*, and told us with *what kind of Religious Worship*, the *Primitive Christians* Worship'd *God alone*. But he tells us, they *Worshiped God alone*, without specifying the kind of worship, ; therefore it is to be concluded, the *primitive Christians* gave *all kind of Religious Worship* only to *Almighty God*.

Theophilus Bishop of Antioch, gives this as a Reason why *Ad Autolicum* Christians refus'd to give Adoration to *Heathen Emperors*, Lib. 1. viz, "because it is not lawful to worship any but God alone.

The *Adoration* the *Heathen Emperors* desir'd from 'em, was not the *Same* that was given to their *Chief Gods* ; but only a *middle kind of Worship*, the same which they gave to *Deify'd Men* : And which the *Senate of Rome* decreed to some *Emperors*. Which *middle kind of Worship* was by the *Christians of the second Century* held to be *due only to God*.

Epiphanius refuting the *Heresy of the Collyridians* (a sort of *Heres. 49. pag. 447. 448. 449.* Women that Worship'd the *Virgin Mary*, as *Queen of Heaven*, offering her *Cakes* at certain seasons of the Year) writes thus.

" If God, (saith he,) will not have the *Angels* to be
" Worshiped, how much more will he not have *her*, who
" was born of *Anna* ? Let *Mary* be had in honour, but let
" God be Worshiped. What Scripture, saith he, hath deli-
" ver'd any thing concerning this ? which of the *Prophets*
" have permitted a *Man* (that I may not say a *Woman*) to
" be Worship'd ? Let no *Man* worship *Mary*. This *Mystery*
" is appointed, I do not say for a *Woman*, nor yet for a
" *Man* neither ; but for *God*. The *Angels* themselves
" are not Capable of such kind of glorifying ; for altho' the
" Tree be beautiful, yet it is not for meat : Tho' *Mary*
" be most excellent and holy, and to be honour'd, yet she is
" not to be worship'd. The *Body of Mary* was *Holy* indeed,
" but not *God* : The *Virgin* indeed was a *Virgin* and honou-
" rable, but not given to us for *Adoration*, but one that did
" herself worship him that was born of her in the flesh, And came
" down from Heaven out of the Bosom of the Father.

" *Saint Austin* tells us, That the worshipping Men that are *De verâ Reli-*
" Dead, shou'd be not part of our Religion ; because if they gione Chap.
" did live Piously, they are not held as such as wou'd seek 55.
that

Rev. 22.9. v.

Tract. 2. in
Johannem.De Quant. a-
nimæ Cap. 34.Contra Fau-
stum Lib. 20.
Cap. 21.Euseb. Ecclef.
Hist. Lib. 4.
Cap. 15.

that kind of honour; they are therefore to be honour'd
for Imitation, but not to be ado'd for Religion. And
in the same Place speaking of *Angels*: "We honour 'em,
(saith he) with Love, not with Service, neither do we
build Temples to 'em: for it is not their will they shou'd
be so honour'd by us, because they know that we our
selves, if we be good, are the *Temples of the high God*;
and therefore it's rightly written, that a *Man* was for-
bidden by an *Angel* that he shou'd not worship him.

And in another place the same *Father* tells us, "That
the Doctrine of Christian Religion is to *worship one God*;
because *God* only can make the *Soul* happy. For, (saith
he) it is made happy by the Participation of *God*; and
not of a *Blessed Soul*, or *Angel*.

"The same *Father* further tells us, that it's the Chara-
cter of true Religion, that it *unites us to God*; without
giving worship to any other thing, how excellent soe-
ver. And that it's a singular part of Christian Doctrine,
that no creature have the worship of the *Soul*: That the
most wise and perfect man, the most accomplisht and happy
Soul, is only to be lov'd, and imitated; and honour to
be given it according to its desert and order. For thou
shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

The same *Father* in his Answer to *Faustus* the *Manichean*
(who charg'd the *African* Christians with *Idolatry* in the
Honour they gave to the *Memories* of the *Martyrs*) tells him,
that they erected no Altars to any *Martyr*, but only to the
God of Martyrs: altho' it were for their *Memories*. "For
who of the Bishops or Priests, (saith he) that officiates at
the Altar (in the Places of the Sepulchres) ever said,
we offer to thee *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Cyprian*? but that
which is offer'd is offer'd to *God*, who crowned the
Martyrs, but it's done at their Sepulchres whom he
hath crowned: that by the very Places our affections
may be rais'd, and our Love quickned both to those
whom we may Imitate, and to him by whom we are
Enabled to do it.

The Church of *Smyrna* (in their Testimony concerning
the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*) do distinguish betwixt honour
and worship: denying any worship of the Creature to be con-
sistent with *Christianity*: yet acknowledge the Honour and
Esteem they had for the *Martyrs*; which they expressed by
meeting

meeting at the *Places* of their Martyrdom, keeping their *Anniversary Days*, and recommending their *Example* to the *Imitation* of others.

St. Austin's Authority is much insisted on by the *Roman Doctors* to justify their *three kinds* of *Religious Worship*: But therein they grossly abuse him and mistake his meaning. As is most learnedly and largely prov'd by *Dr. Stillingfleet* in his *Defence against T. G.* to whom I refer the Reader that wou'd be satisfied in this Particular.

Having now prov'd my *First Proposition*, viz. that all kind or manner of *Religious Worship*, is due only to *Almighty God*.

I proceed to prove my *Second Proposition*, viz. That Solemn *Prayer* is one of the most eminent parts of that *Religious Worship*, that is due only to *Almighty God*. - And Consequently, to make such *Solemn Prayers* to the *Virgin Mary* and other *Saints* as most *Roman Catholics* do, is plain palpable, and flat *Idolatry*. By *Solemn Prayer*, I understand, *Prayer on bended knees, with hands and Eyes lifted up to Heaven*; And such other *Postures of Devotion*, which we make use of in *supplicating God*. All which *Roman Catholics* make use of in *Supplicating the Virgin Mary*, and other *Saints*; tho' *Christ* in his *Directive Prayer* teaches us to use 'em only to *Our Father which is in Heaven*: As being the most eminent part of *Worship* we can yield to him, and highest *Declaration* or *Acknowledgment* we can make of our *Submission* and *Subjection* to him, and *Dependence* on him. And for this Reason the *Place* of *God's* *Solemn Worship* is *Denominated in Scripture the house of Prayer*; and the *Sacrifice of Prayer* prefer'd before all *bloody Sacrifices*: which were accounted the highest *Acts of Religious Worship* under the *Law*. But herein enough has been already said in *Chap. 7. Arg. 4.* And elsewhere.

I shall only here add to strengthen this Argument that to offer *Prayer* (especially *Mental Prayer* which the *Roman Church* allows) to any other *Inhabitant of the invisible World* besides *God*, do's in the *Nature* of the *Act*, whatever be the *intention* of the *Offerer*, ascribe such a *vast unlimited Knowledge* to the *Being* we pray to, as belongs only to the *Omniscient God*. What greater Instance can we have of his own boundless knowledge, than that he hears all the *Prayers* that are offer'd to him by all his reasonable *Creatures* in

Ila. 56. 7. v.
Mat. 21. 13. v.

the several parts of this habitable World, and at one view sees all their various circumstances and necessities, and understands the very inward frame and desire of their Hearts? How plainly then is it injurious to the glory of this *incommunicable knowledge* of God to ascribe it to any created Being? And yet nothing cou'd be more unreasonable than those Devotions which the *Papists* every where daily offer to the Blessed *Virgin* or other *Saints*, if they did not suppose 'em to be endued with this *vast* and *Extensive Knowledge*. Nay, nothing cou'd be more unreasonable than to offer *Mental Prayers* to her or them, unless they suppos'd her capable of knowing the inward *thoughts* and *desires* of the *Offerers*. And what is this less than ascribing to her the peculiar Priviledge of God, who *alone knows the Hearts of the Children of Men*? So that *Prayer* offer'd to any *Inhabitants of the invisible World* do's in the Nature of the thing ascribe such a Perfection of Knowledge to 'em as belongs *only to God*; and consequently do's most justly fall under this charge of *Idolatry*, as 'tis an *Invasion of his peculiar Honour*, and giving some part of his *Incommunicable Glory* to a *Creature*.

The *Conclusion* is, that forasmuch as *Idolatry* (according to the Doctrine of the *Schoolmen* and best *Divines* of the *Roman Church*) consists not only in *Worshipping of false Gods*, and their *Representations* (which they call *Idols*) but in giving *that Worship to the Creature that is due only to the true God*. And forasmuch as all *Religious Worship* is due *only to God*, and that *Adoration* and *Invocation* are parts of *Religious Worship*; it must necessarily follow, that to *Adore* or *pray* to the *Virgin Mary*, or any other *Saint in Heaven*, is to give 'em that *Worship* that is due *only to the true God*. And Consequently such as *Adore* 'em, or *pray to* 'em, are guilty of *Idolatry*, according to the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*.

C H A P. X.

Containing an Answer to such Scriptures, Arguments, and Reasons as are insisted on by the Roman Doctors: to prove the Lawfulness of giving some kind of Religious Worship to the Creature.

HAVING prov'd that all Divine or Religious Worship of what kind or sort soever, appertains only to Almighty God: I shall now proceed to Answer such Scriptures, Reasons and Arguments, as are insisted on by the Roman Doctors to prove the Lawfulness of giving some kind of Religious Worship to the Creature.

In the first place, they Argue from the Worship we find Obj. 1. in Scripture given to Angels.

To all such Scriptures as are produc'd by 'em in proof Answer. hereof, we Answer, saying, that they relate only to Civil Worship, or honour given to 'em as supposed Strangers, and Inhabitants in this World. Balaam's Prostration was the Product of his fear; the Apprehension of his Danger (seeing Numb. 22. 31. an Angel with a drawn sword) so astonish't him, that he fell verse. on his face to the ground: His Prostration was no Act of Worship, but the effect of Astonishment. The Angel that Joshua worship'd was no created Angel, but the Second Person of the Joth. 5. 14. v. ever blessed Trinity, call'd the Angel of the Covenant Mal. 3.

1. The same that appear'd to Moses in the Bush, and the Exod. 3. 2. v. same which God promis'd to send before the Israelites: and Exod. 33. 2. is call'd God's Presence, Exod. 33. 2. 14. v.

In the second place, they argue from Moses and Joshua's Obj. 2. being commanded by God to give Religious Worship to the Exod. 3. 5. v. ground by pulling off their shoes. Jos. 5. 15. v.

Answer 1. What Moses and Joshua did they had an Sol. express Command from God for; which can't be pretended for Worshipping Saints and Angels.

2. The pulling off their shoes was only a Ceremony us'd in those Eastern Countrys, equivalent to our pulling off our Hats: an Expression of Respect, which we manifest in our Churches,

because *dedicated to God's service*, and necessary places for our Publick Worshipping of God.

3. *Moses and Joshua did not worship the Ground.* The Ground was *holy* by reason of God's *special presence* there; and therefore it became their duty to demean themselves more reverently *there* than in *another places*. But God only was the *Object* of their *Worship* or *Adoration*, and not the Ground: The *holiness* of the Ground was only the *occasion* of their *worshipping God in those places*. All that can be hence *inferred* is, that the *special presence* of God in a place requires our *worshipping God therein*; and our manifestation thereof by *outward Acts of Worship*.

Obj. 3.

Thirdly, They argue that if *any Worship* be due to *Saints in Heaven*, it must be *Religious Worship*; but to *Saints in Heaven* some worship must be due (forasmuch as they are the *adopted Sons of God*) and if any worship be due to *Men on Earth*, it must be much more due to *Saints in Heaven*.

Sol.

Answer. *Worship* is not due but where there is *Superiority*; the *Saints in Heaven* have no *Superiority* over us; God has not committed the *Government*, or *Administration* of the Affairs of the World to *Saints* or *Angels*: He hath put all things under the *Feet of Christ*. All *Power in Heaven and Earth* is committed to the *Son of God*; All our *Mercys* and *Blessings* we receive from God by him. It's he alone that is the *giver of every good gift and grace*: *Angels* are no more but *Servants* sent on *God's Errand*, for the good of Mankind: They are his *Ministring Spirits* and our *Fellow-servants*. And therefore to none in Heaven but only to God, is *Worship* due from us. The *Saints in Heaven* being but *Fellow Servants* to God, with us; we are to *honour* 'em for their *graces*, but are to give *Religious Worship* only to *their God and ours*.

Civil Worship is due to God's *Vicegerent* here on Earth, and to *others*, in whom *Superiority* is plac'd over us by God, but to the *Saints in Heaven*, there is no more due from us, but *Love and Honour*.

Obj. 4.

Fourthly, They argue that if *Honour* and *Reverence* be due to *Saints in Heaven*, it must be *Religious honour* and *Reverence*, but *Honour* and *Reverence* is acknowledged by *Protestants* to be due to 'em.

Sol.

Answer. *Honour* and *Reverence* (the same may be said of *Worship*) may be term'd *Religious*, because it is *requir'd* by the

Rule

Rule of Religion ; and in this sense the *Worship* given to *Princes*, may be call'd *Religious Worship* : And the *Honour* and *Reverence* given to *Saints* may be call'd *Religious Honour* and *Reverence*. But if by *Religious Honour*, *Reverence*, and *Worship* we understand that *Honour*, *Reverence*, and *Worship* that is Accompany'd with such *Circumstances* as make it a *Religious Performance*, it is not to be given to any but to God alone.

Lastly, They Argue, that if it be lawful to express our *Obj. 5.*
Reverence to *Saints on Earth*, by pulling off our Hats and bowing our *Body's* to 'em, why may we not make the same Expressions of our *Honour* and *Reverence* to the *Saints in Heaven* ?

Answer. The *Saints on Earth* besides their *Divine Graces*, Sol.
have *natural* and *acquir'd Excellencies*, and *Endowments*, and therefore the *Honour* given 'em redounds to the *Possessor* of those *Excellencies* and *Endowments*. But the *Saints in Heaven* having only *Divine Graces*, the *honour* on their account do's belong only to God, who is the *Giver of those Graces*. And therefore the way to Express our *Love* and *Honour* to the *Saints in Heaven* is not by such *External signs*, wherewith we honour *Saints on Earth*, but by our *Thanksgiving* to God for 'em.

CHAP. XI.

Containing an Answer to such Arguments and Reasons as are insisted on by the Roman Doctors, to prove the Lawfulness, and Utility of Praying to Saints Deceas'd.

Reader take Notice that the *Question* betwixt the Reformed and Roman Church, is not whether the *Saints in Heaven* know any thing of the affairs of men on Earth ? or whether they pray for the *Militant Church* in general ? or for the *Members thereof* in particular ? The point debated betwixt 'em is, whether it be Lawful, on bended knees, with Hands and Eyes lifted up to Heaven, and all Postures of Devotion us'd in Prayer to God ; to supplicate 'em for Aid and Help ? And that thro' their merits we may obtain our Requests from God ? All which is taught and practis'd in the Roman Church, and for the Reasons aforesaid, prov'd to be *Idolatry*. I come now

now to Consider such *Arguments* or *Reasons*, as are insisted on by the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church*, to prove the *Lawfulness*, and usefulness of *praying to Saints Deceas'd*.

Obj. 1.

In the *first place* they argue from the *Command* that *Christians have here on Earth* to require each others *Prayers* to *God* for them. And if it be our *Duty* to require the *Prayers* of *Saints on Earth* to *Supplicate* *God* in our behalf, it must be much more our *Duty* to require the *Prayers* of *Saints in Heaven* : They being exalted to a higher *Degree* of favour with *God* than are the *Saints on Earth* ; And *Consequently* in a *Condition* to *benefit* us more by their *Prayers* to *God* for us than it's possible for *Saints on Earth* to do.

Sol:

Answer. Many *reasons* may be given why it is *Lawful* to request the *Prayers* of *Saints here on Earth*, and yet *unlawful* to supplicate any *in Heaven* but only *God*. As,

1. Because we have a *Command* for requiring each others prayers here on *Earth*, but we have *no Command* to supplicate any *in Heaven* but only *God*, *Matth. 6. 9. v.*

2. Because we can have no reasonable *Assurance* that the *Saints in Heaven* do hear our *Prayers* (as has been prov'd *Chap: 4th. Argument 1st.*) and therefore have not the same *Reasons* to request their *Prayers* to *God* for us that we have to request the *Prayers* of *Saints on Earth*.

3. Our *Prayers* to each other in this *Life* are only *Christian Requests* to recommend our *Conditions* to *God* : *Offices* only of *Kindness*, no *Acts of Religious Worship*. But *Prayers* to *Saints in Heaven* (as practic'd in the *Roman Church*) are *Acts of Religious Worship*, and *Eminent parts* thereof.

Shou'd any *Man* in the *Publick Congregation* on bended *Knees*, with *Hands* and *Eyes lifted up to Heaven*, in time of *Publick Prayer*, and amidst his *Solemn Prayers to God*; have *Supplicated Saint Paul*, when he was on *Earth*, for *Aid* and *Help*, for the *Conference of Gifts and Graces*; he wou'd
Acts 14. 14. v have rent his *Cloaths*, and said to 'em as he did to the *Inhabitants of Lystra*, *Why do ye these things?* And surely *St. Paul* is no less *Careful* (now *in Heaven*) to preserve entire *God's Prerogative*, than he was while he remain'd *here on Earth*.

4. There is a great deal of *Difference* betwixt *S. Paul's* saying, *Brethren pray for us*, or our requesting the *Prayers* of the *Faithful* here on *Earth* for us, and *praying to Saints in Heaven*, as *Practic'd* in the *Roman Church*. Our's are only
wishes,

wishes and Requests; *their's*, Solemn Prayers on bended Knees made in the Places and proper Seasons of Divine Worship; and joyn'd with the Prayers they make to God? Using the same Postures and Expressions of Devotions they use to God himself. They pray not to 'em only as to Attorneys and Advocates to carry their suits to God, but they pray to 'em for Help and Aid. They make 'em Joint-Petitioners with Christ; relying on *their merits* as well as the *merits of Christ*. And therefore can't infer the Lawfulness of their Practice, from our requesting the Faithful here on Earth to pray for us.

Lastly. Christ is therefore *Ascended into Heaven* to be an Advocate for Sinners here on Earth: To intercede for 'em with the Divine Majesty in Heaven. It is his sole and most Royal Prerogative, as has been prov'd Chap. 4th. Argument 2d. And therefore we are not to Petition any in Heaven but only Christ to plead our Cause, to solicit our Affairs, and present our Supplications to the Divine Majesty.

In the *Tabernacle of this World* we are to request the prayers of every good Christian for us: But in the *Tabernacle of Heaven*, we are to call on none but him in whom we believe.

As in the outward Court of the Jewish Tabernacle, every Priest was permitted to officiate, to receive and present the Devotions of the People to the Divine Majesty; but in the Holy Place, within the Vail, none but the High-Priest was to do any Office or Service: Even so in the *Tabernacle of this World*, every Christian being a Priest to God, has this Honour conferr'd upon him; But in the *Holy of Holy's* (i. e. Heaven) none but Christ our High-Priest is to officiate. He only is there to appear in the Presence of God for us, it is his Prerogative alone to receive our Prayers and present 'em to the Divine Majesty: For as none but the High-Priest was to offer Incense in the *Holy of Holy's*, so none in Heaven but Christ our High-Priest is to offer our Prayers to God his Father; He alone is that Angel to whom much Incense was given, that he shou'd offer it with the Prayers of all Saints, upon the Golden Altar that was before the Throne, Rev. 8. 3 v. Alluding to the Altar that was before the Mercy-Seat, on which the High-Priest only was to offer Incense.

Obj. 1.

2. In the *Second place* they argue that forasmuch as the Saints in Heaven are in high favour with God, they ought to be *honour'd* by us; And the *Honour* we give 'em, we give to God in them, or to God for 'em.

Sol.

Answer. Protestants do not deny Honour to be given to the Saints in Heaven; they honour 'em with the honour of Love, they praise God for 'em; It's the honour of *Invoking* 'em, or giving Religious Worship to 'em, that Protestants refuse to honour 'em with. They say with Epiphanius, Let the Blessed Virgin and all the Saints be honour'd, let their Memory's be had in Esteem: But let God alone be worship'd. The Saints desire no such honour at our Hands, nor can we displease 'em more then by giving 'em that Worship which is due only to their God and ours; which the worship of *Invocation* is, (as has been already sufficiently prov'd).

Obj. 3.

3. Thirdly, They argue, that as here on Earth all favours are conferr'd by the *Mediation* of Courtiers and Favourites (Men don't presently run to Kings to present their Requests, but first go to such as are in favour with 'em, that by their means they may procure Access) even so, it is fitting that we have Recourse to Saints, who are Favourites in Heaven, that we may obtain Access to God, and have our Suits accepted of him.

Answer 1. Shou'd any Earthly Prince declare he will have no Solicitor but his Son, and that all Favours and Royal Graces shall come to his Subjects thro' his hands, and by means of his Mediation; what favour can we suppose such Subjects to deserve, who (contrary to their Princes Command) make their Application to other Favourites? The Case is here the same.

2. Earthly Princes can't give Audience to all their Subjects, and therefore we Petition them by such as enjoy their Presence: But God is Omnipresent, and admits every Man to the Throne of Grace; he is never asleep, or busy, or weary; but his Ears are always open, and his Head bowed down to the

Acts 10. 34 v.
Matth. 11. 28
John 6 37
John 14. 13
14. v.

Prayers of his People. With God there is no respect of Persons, he gives alike Access to the Beggar as to the Prince, and promises to cast out none that make their Application to him; and bids us not to ask any thing from him in the name of any Saint, and promises whatever we ask in his Son's Name, he will do it. Shou'd any Earthly Prince thus invite his Subjects to Petition him for the supply of their wants,

wants, we shou'd account him no better than a *Fool* or a *Madman* that wou'd apply himself to any of his *Favourite*s. Ser. 7, de Penitentiâ Tom.

" When (saith *Chrysostom*) thou hast need to sue to Men thou art forc'd first to deal with *Door-keepers*, and in-
" treat *Parasites* and *Flatterers*, and to go a long way a-
" bout; but with God there is no such matter, without
" an Intercessor he is intreated; without Money, without
" Cost, he yieldeth to thy suit; it sufficeth only that thou
" cry in thy Heart, and bring Tears with thee, and thou
" drawest him to thee.

The same *Father* in another place tells us, " That In Psal. 4.
" among Men, it becometh him that comes to another, to
" be a Man of Speech, and that he shou'd flatter all those
" that are about the Prince: but to find Acceptance with
" God, there needs nothing but a *watchful Mind*.

The same *Father* in his Sermon on the *Woman of Canaan* writes thus, " God is always near. If thou Intreatest Man,
" thou askest, *what is he a doing?* And he's *Asleep*, he is
" not at *Leisure*; or the *Servant* giveth thee no Answer: But
" with God there is none of these things; Whithersoever
" thou goest and callest, he heareth, there is no want of
" *Leisure*. Say, *have Mercy on me*, and presently *God is with thee*.

" Mark, (saith he) the *Wisdom* of the *Woman of Canaan*,
" She intreateth not *James*, she beseecheth not *John*, nor
" doth she come to *Peter*; but breaks thro' the whole
" Company of 'em, saying, I have no need of a *Mediator*,
" but taking *Repentance* with me for a *Spokesman*, I come
" to the *Fountain it self*: For this Cause did he *take flesh*,
" that I might have the boldness to speak to him by
" my self.

And in another place tells us, " That we need not apply In Psal. 4.
" our selves to *Door-Keepers*, or *Stewards*, or *Procurators*,
" or *Friends*, to bring us to God; for then God doth
" most for us when we come to him *immediately*, not ma-
" king use of others: and the reason why God do's so
" (he tells us) is, because God loves our Friendship, and
" do's all things that we may put our confidence in him:
" And therefore when he beholdeth us coming to him our
" selves, then doth he most yield to our Suits. Thus dealt
" he with the *Woman of Canaan*, when *Peter* and *James*
" came to him for her, he did not yield: but when she

“ herself did Petition, he presently gave her what she desired.”

Obj. 4.

Lastly, They argue, that in respect of the *Reverence* we owe to God, it is necessary we apply our selves to *Saints*. “ A Sinner (say they) that has offended God, because he dare not come to him in his own Person, ought to have recourse to *Saints*, and implore their *Patronage*.”

“ It makes (saith *Gabriel Biel*) for the *Reverence* of God, that a Sinner that hath offended God, not daring for the Dross of his Sin to appear in proper Person before the most High and Dreadful Majesty; Shou’d have Recourse to *Saints* who are most grateful to God, who may present the Sinners Prayers to the Most High-Majesty: And by adjoyning their Merits and Prayers there-to, make the same fit for *Audience*, more pleasing and grateful.”

Answer. What has been said to the former *Objection*, may serve for an *Answer* to this. To which I shall add the *Prodigal’s Example*, *Luke 15. 18 v.* who purposing to return home, resolv’d not to apply himself to any of his *Father’s Servants* to make his Peace; But to go to his Father, and say unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and before thee, and am not worthy to be called thy Son. In which *Parable* Christ teaches what *Penitent Sinners* in like Cases ought to do.

What Prayer and Supplication (saith *Solomon*) is made by any Man, or by the People of Israel, which shall know the Plague of his own Heart. Hear thou from Heaven thy Dwelling Place, and forgive. In which words King *Solomon* tells us, that the Sense of offending God ought to be a grand Inducement to bring us on our knees to God: And not to fly to any *Saint* or *Angel* to make our Peace.

Hereto may be added those many Encouragements we have from Christ and his *Apostles* to make our Applications only to God; Come to me all ye that are weary and heavy laden (says Christ) and I will give you rest. Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out. If any Man sin we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the Righteous. He is able to save to the uttermost (saith *St. Paul*) all that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for us. To whom therefore shou’d a Sinner apply himself, who is dejected under the sense of the number and heinousness of his

Matt. 11. 28.

John 6. 37.

1 John 2. 1.

Heb 7. 25.

his Sins, but to his *declared Advocate* and *Intercessor*, who can't but take all other Applications most unkindly at his hands?

I therefore conclude with the words of *Chrysostom* (who makes this very same *Objection*). " But (saith he) thou wilt say, what if I have *offended God*? shall I not then make use of the *Intercession* of others? He *Answers* *cease offending*, and *shed Tears*, And thou shall't quickly make *God appeased*. Say only, *I have sinned*, say it from thy Heart, and from a sincere Mind, and *all is loosed*. Thou doest not so much desire thy Sins to be forgiven, as God doth to forgive thee thy Sins. And therefore tells us (as I have elsewhere hinted) " That it was the *Devil* envying Man's felicity in having free access to God (under pretence of *Voluntary Humility*) tempted him to make Application to the Creature.

FINIS.



FINIS

TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS
CONTAINED IN THE THIRD PART OF
THIS DISCOURSE

THIRD
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
Worship of *IMAGES*.

THIRD
DISCOURSE

Worship
of the
BRITISH MUSEUM
VASES



A Table of the CHAPTERS
contain'd in the Third Part of
this Discourse.

C H A P. I.

Containing an Introduction to the following Discourse;
wherein is shew'd there were no Images worshipped
in the Christian Church till above four hundred Years
after Christ.

C H A P. II.

Wherein the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church,
relating to Image-Worship is truly represented.

C H A P. III.

Containing the First Argument against Image-Worship:
wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the true God un-
der any Corporeal Representation, Similitude, or Like-
ness whatever is forbidden in the Second Commandment.

C H A P. IV.

Containing a Second Argument against Image-Worship:
Wherein is prov'd that the Worshipping the true God
under any Corporeal Representation, or Similitude
whatever, is as great Idolatry as was Aaron's and the
Israelites in Worshipping the Golden Calf. Exod. 32.

C H A P. V.

Containing a Third Argument against Image-Worship:
Wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the true God
under any Corporeal Representation, or Similitude what-
ever, is as great Idolatry as was Jeroboam's and the
Ten Tribes, in worshipping the Calves at Dan and
Bethel

C H A P.

A Table, &c.

CHAP. VI.

Containing a Fourth Argument against Image-Worship: Wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the true God under any Corporeal Representation or Similitude whatever, is as great Idolatry, as what St. Paul charges the Athenians with, Acts 17.

CHAP. VII.

Containing a Fifth Argument against Image-Worship: Wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the true God under any Corporeal Representation or Similitude whatever, is as great Idolatry, as what St. Paul charges the Wiser Heathens with, Rom. 1. 18, 19, 20, 21 v.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing a Sixth Argument against Image-Worship: wherein is prov'd that it is greater Idolatry to worship God under the Image of a Man; than to worship Stones, Groves, and Fountains; Sun, Moon, and Stars; and all kind of Animals whatever as Representations of God.

CHAP. IX.

Containing a Seventh Argument against Image-Worship: Wherein is prov'd that to worship any Image whatever is Idolatry.

CHAP. X.

Containing an Answer to such Arguments or Reasons as are insisted on by Learned Men of the Roman Church to prove the Lawfulness of Image-Worship.

CHAP. XI.

Containing a short History of the Beginning, Cause and Progress of Image-Worship, together with a Conclusion to the whole Discourse.



CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Containing an Introduction to the following
DISCOURSE.

Wherein is shew'd that there were no Images Worship'd in the Christian Church till above Four hundred Years after Christ:

THAT God disallow'd the *Worship of Images* in the *Jewish Church*, is on all sides assented to. As also that the *Jews*, after their *Return* from the *Babylonish Captivity*, were so Zealous against *Images* that they abhorr'd the sight of 'em : concluding the sufferings they underwent, to be a punishment inflicted on 'em, for their former *Idolatrys*. *Bellarmino* tells us they were *Haters of Images* even to *Superstition*.

That there were no *Images* worship'd in the *Christian Church* for the first four hundred Years after Christ, is evidenc'd from those bitter *Invectives* against *Images*, that are to be found in the *Writings* of the *Fathers*, and *Writers* of those Times: which are collected by Doctor *Jeremy Taylor* Bishop of *Down and Connor*; and to be found in his *Vindication* of his *Dissuasive from Popery*. Part 1d. *Wherein* he shews, that the *Fathers* who liv'd in those Times were so Zealous against *Images*, that it's to be doubted whether they allow'd so much as the making of 'em.

" *Clemens Alexandrinus* tells us, that we are forbidden *Proter. ad*
" that deceitful Art; for the Prophet saith, *thou shalt Gentes. p. 41.*
" not make the likeness of any thing either in Heaven above,
" or in the Earth beneath.

Tertullian tells us, " That it was the Devil brought in-
A a to

No Images in the Primitive Church.

de Joh. c. 3.

Cont. Celsum
Lib. 4. p. 181.

2. " to the World the *Artificers of Statues and Images*, and
" all kind of *Representations*.
" *Origen* tells us, " That in the *Jewish Common-Wealth*
" neither a *Painter* nor a *Statuary* were admitted, their
" *Laws* wholly forbidding 'em; least any occasion shou'd
" be given to turn 'em from the *Worship of God* to Earth-
" ly things.

The *Jesuit Petavius* acknowledges that *Christians* in the
Primitive times had no *Images*: But tells us the Reason
was, *Because the Memory of the Heathen Idolatry was fresh*:
And therefore it was thought expedient not to have Images till
it was rooted out. Which Reason is a charging of the *Fa-*
thers that wrote against *Images*, with *Hypocrisy*, in de-
signing to introduce *Images*, when by their *Investives* a-
gainst 'em, they had eradicated the *Images* of the *Hea-*
thens. Such *Designs* might be very consistent with the
Prudence and *Policy* of the *Roman Jesuits*: But not with
the *Simplicity* and *Integrity* of the *Primitive Fathers*.

I shall only at present offer two *Reasons* to the *Reader's*
Consideration, to prove that there were no *Images* in *Chri-*
stian Churches for the first four hundred *Years* after *Christ*.
1. *Because the Jews*, who *abhor'd Images*, and were *Haters*
of 'em even to *Superstition* (as *Bellarmin* tells us) in all their
disputations with *Christians* during the four first *Centuries*,
never objected against 'em, their *having Images* in their
Churches: much less the *worshipping of 'em*: Which, doubt-
less, they wou'd not have omitted, had *Christians* been
guilty of any such *Practice*.

In a large Disputation betwixt *Tryphon the Jew*, and *Justin*
Martyr, wherein the *Jew* reproaches the *Christians* as much
as he is able: yet he lays no such *Charge* against 'em as
Image-Worship.

In all *Tertullian's* Book against the *Jews*, there is no
mention made of *Images*; which questionless there wou'd
have been, had *Images* been us'd by *Christians* in *Tertullian's*
time. In the 5th *Century* when the *Worship of Images* in
some *Churches* began to be us'd, in Compliance with *Gen-*
tilism, we have mention made of 'em in the writings of
those times; and the Testimonys of *Jews* upbraiding *Chri-*
stians with their practice.

2. *Because the Fathers* that wrote against *Chri-*
stians during the first four *Centuries* and upwards, do not
charge



No Images in the Primitive Church.

3

charge *Christians* with the use of *Images*. We find *Christians* to charge them with their *Images*; and to glory much in their advantages against 'em upon the account of their *unreasonableness* in *worshipping* of 'em. Certainly had *Christians* us'd any such *Practice*, the *Heaven writers* wou'd not have omitted to *retort* the *Charge* upon 'em, as being the principal *Argument* they cou'd have urg'd in their own defence. I say they wou'd, questionless, have shew'd the *unreasonableness* of *Christians* in *criminating* them with a *Practice*, whereof *themselves* were *guilty*. And it must have concluded the *Christian Writers* guilty of much *Imprudence*, and *Injustice*, in writing so bitterly against *Images* in *general*; had there been any in use among themselves: Had they believ'd their use might have been in any kind *Lawful*, they wou'd have shew'd wherein the *Heathens* sin'd; what kind of *Images* were *Lawful*, and what not, and what kind of *worship* might be given to such *Images* as were *Lawful*, and what kind of *worship* was *unlawful* to give 'em. But in all their *Commentaries* and *Explications* on the *Commandments*, they give no *Rules* nor *Directions*, no *Cautions* or *Distinctions* about *Image-worship*, to prevent the erring of *Christians* in that particular: But bitterly *Inveigh* against all *Image-worship* in *general*; which undeniably proves that there was no such *Practice* in the *Church of God* in the *Primitive Times*; and that the *Fathers* *disallow'd* the *worshipping* of all kind of *Images* whatever.

There are some of the *Fathers* that speak with great affection and veneration of the *Cross*: their Intent thereby being only to exalt the *Passion of Christ*. In which Sense *St. Paul* is said to glory in the *Cross of Christ*; not meaning the *material Cross*, much less the *Images* thereof. In which sense *St. Ambrose* and *St. Jerom* are to be understood, and *Tertullian*, when he calls *Christians*, *Religiosi crucis*, meaning thereby that they were not *asham'd* of him that suffer'd thereon.

de Obi. Theo-
dosi.
Epitaph.
Paul. Mart.

To these two *Reasons* I shall add a few *Historical* instances; shewing that there was no such practice as *Image Worship* in the *Christian Church* during the *four first Centuries*.

The first that I shall mention is that famous *Story* of *Epiphanius*, who (about the end of the *fourth Century*) finding an *Image* in the *Church of Anablatha*, under the Government of *John Bishop of Jerusalem*; he tore it in pieces; and concern-

4. No Images in the Primitive Church.

ning this fact he wrote to the *Bishop of Jerusalem* these words.
 " I found (saith he) a *Veil* hanging at the Door of the
 " Church dy'd and painted; having the *Image* as it were of
 " *Christ*, or some *Saint*, for I don't well remember whose
 " *Image* it was. When therefore I saw this, that contrary
 " to the Authority of Scriptures, the *Image* of a Man
 " was hung up in the Church of *Christ*, I cut it, and gave
 " counsel to the *Keepers* of the Place, that they shou'd
 " rather bury some dead Man in it.

And afterwards he entreats the *Bishop of Jerusalem*, to give charge hereafter, that such *Veils* as those (which are repugnant to our Religion) shou'd not be hung up in the Church of *Christ*.

This *Epistle* is by *St. Jerom* translated into *Latin*, and to be found in the first Tome of his Works.

Bellarmino and *Baronius* deny this fact of *Epiphanius* (because it gives a deadly wound to *Image-Worship*) and tells us, That it was in after Ages added to the *Epistle* translated by *St. Jerom*: But gives no reason to prove it, save only that the *Constantinopolitan Fathers* make no mention of it; and that it's not likely they wou'd have omitted so material a Passage against *Images*, had there been any such thing. This Reason of *Bellarmino* and *Baronius* proves nothing, being only a *Negative*. The *Constantinopolitan Fathers* quote *Epiphanius's* Advice to Christians in his Time; not to bring *Images* into Churches, nor into the Cemiterys of the *Saints*: But always to carry about 'em the Remembrance of God in their Hearts. These words of *Epiphanius* are cited by 'em, and to be found in the 6th *Action*, and 5th Tome of the second Council, assembled for the Establishment of *Images*.

The *Constantinopolitan Fathers* having quoted *Epiphanius's* Judgment, which being expressly against *Images*, there was no need to quote his Practice, or to make mention of the fact done by him.

The Reality of this fact of *Epiphanius*, is by unanswerable Reasons prov'd by Protestant Divines.

1. Because this *Epistle* of *St. Jerom*, with this story, is quoted by the Council held by *Charles the Great*, about nine hundred Years ago.

2. It is quoted by the Council held at *Paris*, under *Ludovicus Pius*, a little after.

3. The Jesuit *Syrmondus* cites this *Epistle*, as the genuine Work of *Epiphanius*.

4. *Marianus*

4. *Marianus Victor*, and the *Jesuit Petavium*, in their Editions of *Epiphanius* have publish'd this whole *Epistle*, and have made no note, nor have given any censure on this story.

5. Before them *Thomas Waldensis*, and since him *Alphonsus a Castro* acknowledge this whole *Epistle* to be the genuine work of *Epiphanius*.

6. Because if this Story was added in latter Times, to the *Epistle* of *St. Jerom*, it must be added thereto either by the *Greeks*, or *Latins*.

1. Not by the *Greeks*, who were against *Images*, for if it had been added thereto by them, it wou'd have been cited by 'em in the *Constantinopolitan Council* in their *Disputations* against *Images*. Therefore their not citing of it is so far from disproving it's Authenticalness, that it rather proves it.

2. It cou'd not be added thereto by the *Latines*, because they all held that *Images* might be retain'd in Churches; provided no worship was given to 'em.

The *Bishops* of the *Second Nicene Council*, commanded all *Writings* against *Images*, to be brought to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, there to be laid with the *Writings* of other *Hereticks*; Since which time *Epiphanius's* *Greek Original* *Epistle* has not been seen; which shews there was something in it against *Images*, displeasing to those *Fathers* that caus'd it to be suppress'd. The *Latin Copys* still remain, and in all of 'em we have this Story of *Epiphanius*.

Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* tells us, that in his *Cap. 17.* Time there were *Images* of *Christ*, *St. Paul* and *St. Peter*, (but not in Churches) and the reason why there were such *Images*, (he there tells us) was, "Because it was the Custom of the *Heathens* to honour those they accounted their Benefactors, and Saviours, by erecting of their Statues. Of that which he saw of *Christ*, there was a fabulous Report, that it was made by the *Woman* he cur'd of the bloody Issue, who spent her Substance on *Physicians*. " And " it's no marvel (saith he) that those *Gentiles* of old which " receiv'd benefit by our *Saviour*, shou'd do such things; " for it hath been usual (by an *Heathenish* Custom) thus " to honour them, whom they accounted their Benefactors and Friends.

Observe, *Eusebius* calls it an *Heathenish Custom*, and if any such thing were done, it was done in imitation of the *Heathens*. And

And that *Eusebius* held it unlawful to make any Picture of *Christ*, appears from his Answer to the *Sister of Constantius* the Emperour, *Wife to Licinius*, who being lately converted from *Paganism*, desired *Eusebius* to send her the Picture of *Christ*: to whom he returns Answer, telling

Synod. 7. Act. her, "It was unlawful to make any Picture of him; for reasons to be found in the last Chapter of this Discourse.

6. see Chap. 11. part 13.

De consensu.

Evang. Lib. 1.

cap. 10.

"*St. Austin* tells us, that there were in his Time Pictures of *Christ*, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*; but declares so little Reverence for 'em, that he saith, that they deserv'd to be deceiv'd, who look'd on 'em as Books to be Instructed by: And that it was no wonder to see Feigners of false Doctrines to be led away by Painters.

de fide & sym.

cap. 7.

"And that it was a wicked thing for Christians to erect any such Image (meaning the Image of a Man) in the Church of God.

De Mor. Eccl:

Cathol. Lib.

Cap. 34.

"And tells us, That in his Time there were Worshipers of Graves and Pictures; but the Church ought not to be upbraided with their Practices, whom She herself condemneth as naughty Children. And that the Manichees favour'd Images, that they might reconcile the good will of the Pagans to their miserable and mad Sect.

There is a famous Story relating to Image-Worship that happen'd in the Time of *Gregory the Great*, *Pope of Rome*; which is as followeth,

Serenus, *Bishop of Marseilles*, finding Images in his Church to be worshipp'd, brake 'em down: upon Complaint thereof made to *Pope Gregory*; he writes thus to him,

Greg. regist.

Lib. 7. Epist.

109 ad seren.

& Lib. 9. Ep.

9. ad eundem

"I certify you, (saith he) that it came of late to our hearing, that your Brotherhood seeing certain Worshipers of Images, did break the said Images, and threw 'em away. And surely we commended your Zeal, that nothing made with Hands shou'd be worshipp'd; but yet we judge, you shou'd not have broken the said Images; for painting is therefore us'd in Churches, that they which are unlearn'd, may by the sight read those things on the Walls, which they can't read in Books. Therefore your Brotherhood ought only to have restrain'd the People from worshipping 'em; that both the Ignorant might have had whence to gather the knowledge of History, and the People might not sin in worshipping the Picture. Whence

No Images in the Primitive Church.

7

Whence observe, that Pope Gregory allow'd of no other use of Images in Churches, than that those that are unlearn'd, may by the sight of 'em, read those things on the Walls which they can't read in Books; and therefore wou'd have the Images preserv'd, but the People restrain'd from worshipping of 'em.

Here we have a manifest declaration of one of their Renowned Popes, against Image-worship, after their Introduction into Christian Churches.

The Roman Doctors do alledge Gregory the Great to have been a Favourer of Image-worship: But his Epistle to Secundinus (made use of by 'em to that end) is prov'd by Doctor James to be spurious in his Book of the Corruption of the Fathers. page 76.

There are some Treatises insisted on by the Roman Doctors, to prove the Practice of Image-worship in the Primitive Church, Father'd on St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and others; which are sufficiently manifested to be Counterfeits, by Erasmus, Valla, and Bellarmine himself, in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers.

Epist. ad Julian.
an 205. quest.
ad Antioch.
Princip. Licur.
Chrysostomi.

In a Council held at Eliberis, in Spain, Anno Dom. 305, Images were forbidden to be put in Churches. "It is our mind, (say those Fathers) that Pictures ought not to be in Churches, lest that which is painted on Walls be worshipped.

The Roman Doctors are at their wits end, how to give an Answer to the Decree of this Council, and the best they can invent is, that those Fathers only forbid Pictures to be painted on the Walls of Churches, because they cou'd not speedily be conveyed away; and therefore on the Invasion of Infidels were liable to Derision, and Abuse: as also that by reason of the moisture of the Walls, they became soon blemish'd and defaced.

Reply. Protestants say, no reasonable Man can be satisfy'd with this Answer; for had the Council intended only to avoid theafore said Inconveniences, they wou'd have order'd that Pictures shou'd be made in Frames. But the Fathers plainly tell us, that the Reason why they will have no Pictures in Churches is, lest that which is painted on the walls be Worshipped. So that 'tis to prevent the worshipping of 'em, that they declare to be the reason why they prohibited Pictures to be placed in Churches: It was the fear of introducing

8 *The Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worship*

cing *Idolatry* thereby, that made those *Fathers* declare, that *Images* or *Pictures* ought not to be plac'd in *Churches*, which Reason the *Roman Doctors* wilfully overlook.

Before I conclude this *Introduction*, I think fit to advertise the Reader of this *Discourse*; that when the *Roman Doctors* are pinch't by any quotation out of *Fathers*, or *Text of Scripture*; their common way to evade the force of 'em is, by saying they relate to the *worshiping of Images as Gods*, or *representation of false Gods*: Or if that will not do, then they must relate to the *Worshiping of 'em*, as *perfect resemblances* of the true God; all which they say the *Roman Church* abhors: But to *Worship Images* as *representations* of the true God they allow of.

So that all that Protestants have to prove against 'em is, that to *Worship any Image*, or *Corporeal representation of the true God* is *Idolatry*: which is prov'd in the subsequent *Discourse*.

C H A P. II.

Wherein is shew'd the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church, relating to the Worshiping of the Images of God and Saints.

IN the *Roman Church* God the *Father* is represented in the form of an *old Man*, with a *great grey beard*, and a *Pope's triple Crown* on his head, holding the two *Ends* of the *transverse rafter* of the *Cross*.

The *Sacred Trinity* is worshiped under the representation of *three persons*, of *equal Age*, sometimes of *three Noses* and *four Eyes*, of *one body* and *three heads*, and of *one Body* and *three faces in a knot*.

The *Son of God* is worshiped under the form of a *Young Man*, and of a *Lamb*: And the *Holy Ghost* under the form of a *Dove*.

These *Pictures* are to be seen in the *windows* of their *Churches*, in their *Books of Devotion*, in their *Mass-books* and *Breviary's*, in their *Portnises* and *Manuals*.

de Ador: disp.

3. Sect. 4. l.

250.252.

Bernardus Pujol tells us, That the *Picturing Angels*, and sometimes *God*, under the shape of a *Dove*, and sometimes the

in the Romish Church.

the Picture of the Trinity is a Custom received every where among Catholicks; and that it is allowed by the Council of Trent: And that such Images are to be Worshipped. For, (saith he) as the mind is excited by the Image of Christ, or the Saints, so may Devotion be rais'd by such an Image of the Deity.

Cardinal Cajetane tells us, that the Images of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are painted, not only that they may be seen, as the Cherubims of old in the Temple; but that they may be worshipped as the frequent use of the Church teaches. In tert. part. Thom. q. 25. Arg. 3.

Ysambertus tells us " That they that give Caution concerning the doing of a thing (as the Council of Trent do's about the Images of God) are to be understood to Approve the thing it self: And that the Lawfulness of such Images is so certain, that to say otherwise is rashness: And that the common practice of the Church (for a long season) hath been to have such Images in Churches; and that they were never reprov'd by Pope, or so much as a Provincial Synod. de Myst. Incar. ad quest. 25. disp. 3. Art. 6.

" Vasquez tells us, That the Lawfulness of Images of the Trinity, is prov'd by the most frequent practice of the Church, which commonly in Rome and other places, doth set forth the Image of the Trinity to be Worshipped by the People. Ad 3. Aq. Dis. 103. Cap. 3.

" Ariaga tells us, That it's so certain that such Images are Lawful, that to say the contrary is not only Rashness, but plain Error. For God can't be suppos'd to suffer his Universal Church to Err in a matter of such moment. Ad Tert. Thom. Disp. 5. Sec. 1.

Bellarmin proves their Lawfulness from the general practice of the Church; which wou'd not have suffer'd such an Universal Custom, if such Images had been unlawful. De Imag. Lib. 2. Cap. 8.

" Tannerus affirms, that it is not only lawful to make Images of God, and of the Trinity, but to propose 'em as Objects of Worship: which (he saith) is the Common Opinion of their Divines; and proves it from the practice of their Church; and the Council of Trent. Sess. 25. de Imag. Tom. 3. Disp. 5. q. 2. dub. 3.

Pedro de Cabrera, a Friar of great Eminency, tells us, that it is simply and absolutely to be affirmed, that holy Images are to be worshipped in Churches, and out of Churches: and the contrary is Heretical Doctrine, that is to say, signs of Service, and Submission are to be paid to 'em, as by embracings, lights, oblation of Incence, uncovering the Head, &c. In 3. part. Tho. ques. 25. Art. 3. disp. 2. num. 15.

This Conclusion, saith he, is an Article of Faith, collected

10. *The Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worship*
out of the *Holy Scriptures*, by which it appeareth that things
created, altho' senseless, so that they be consecrated to God, are
to be ador'd.

And whereas *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and some few others
maintain'd that *Images* were only *Improperly* to be ador'd ;
that is to say, because they put *Men in Mind* of the persons
represented by 'em, who are then ador'd before the *Image*, as if
they were present.

Num. 35.

This great *Fryar* thus Censures 'em ; *Images* (saith he)
are really and properly to be ador'd, with an *Intention* of *Adoring*
of themselves, and not only the *Originals* that are represented by
'em.

This *Conclusion* (saith he) is against *Durandus*, and his
followers, whose *Opinion* the *Latter Divines*, have censur'd to
be rash, and favoring of *Heresy*; and by *Victoria* to be plainly
Heretical, and this (saith he) is the common conclusion of all
the *Divines*.

And the *Reason* why the *Divines* have censur'd this *Opinion*
as *Heretical*, he tells us is, because if *Images* be ador'd only
Improperly, or by way of *Remembrance* or *Recordation*, or be-
cause they make us remember the *Originals*, which we do *Worship*
as if they had been present ; it wou'd follow that all creatures shou'd
be ador'd with the same *Adoration*, wherewith we *Worship Images* ;
seeing all of 'em do lead us to the knowledge of God and that God
is present in all things.

In 3. p. q. 25. Suarez tells us, That it is an *Article of Faith*, that *Images*
disp. 54. Sec. are to be ador'd : And that the *Opinion* of *Durandus* is rash,
dangerous, and favouring of *Heresy*; And that *Medina* hath so
determin'd it, who reports that *Victoria* saith it was *Heretical*.
And this conclusion, he saith, is commonly receiv'd among
the *Modern Divines*, and he proves it from the *Definitions*
of *Councils*, especially the *Council of Nice*, and that if *Images*
were only worshiped *Improperly*, the *Worship* of 'em was rather
simply to be deny'd, then affirm'd ; for to worship only before an
Image is to make the *Image* only an *Occasion*, and not the
Object of Worship ; which *Opinion* (he saith) the *Council of*
Nice declar'd against, because according to this *Opinion*, *Images*
wou'd only serve for helps to *Memory*; and for outward signs
to stir up, and excite the worshiper: which those that held were
by the second *Nicene Council* condemn'd for *Hereticks*. And
therefore concludes, that not only external *Acts of Adoration*, are
to be perform'd to *Images*, but the very *Intention of Worship* is

to be directed to 'em. For *Durandus* and his followers did allow external Acts of Adoration to be perform'd towards Images, but held the Inward Intention to be directed only to the Exemplar; And because they deny'd they *Inward intention of worship* to be directed to the Images, he saith their worship of Images was no proper worship, but only Counterfeit: For no Object is truly and properly worshiped by external acts, without the Intention of the Mind. And proves from many passages, that the Council of Nice decreed not only that external Acts of Worship, but the Inward Intention also be directed to the Image; And that the Council of Trent decreed the same, when they say, that due honour and worship is to be given 'em: For there can be no true honour and worship without the Intention. For if the External Acts of worship be perform'd before an Image, either there must be an Intention to worship that Image, before whom they are perform'd, or not; if there be no Intention to worship that Image by those external Acts, then is not the Image worshiped; which is contrary to the decrees of the said Council, therefore Intention is necessary with the External Acts of worship, or else no worship is given to the Image.

Ambrosius Catherinus (an Eminent Divine in the Council of Trent) tells us, "That the Opinion of those who say Images are not truly and properly to be worshiped, but God to be worshiped before an Image; differs very little from those, that deny any worship of Images; and is repugnant to the practice of the Church, which in worshipping the Cross saith *O Crux Ave spes unica, &c. O Cross, save me my only hope.* And proves at large from the Council of Nice, "That true real worship ought to be given to Images; and that they are therefore set up, that they may be properly Worshiped: "And that God himself is believ'd to be present in them, using 'em often for Oracles, and he shews his presence and power in 'em in a particular manner; And that after this manner is fulfilled our Saviour's saying, *I am with You to the end of the World.* And for the sake of this peculiar presence of God, which we sensibly perceive, Images do deserve peculiar Adoration.

Naclantus, an Italian Bishop and Eminent Divine in the Council of Trent, determines positively, That Images are to be Worshiped; and that it is a needless caution for any to say, that they Worship before the Image: but they may say, without the least scruple, that they do Worship the Image.

Enar. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 1.
B b 2 Dominicus

De Inst. &
Jure Lib. 2.
Qui 3. Art. 2.
in iure.

12 The Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worship

Dominicus Soto another eminent *Divine* in the *Council of Trent*, tell us, That *Images* are not intended by the Church only for *helps to memory*, for we do not *Worship* the *Scriptures* or *Names of Saints* which call 'em to our Minds; but we ought to *Worship* the *Images themselves*: For the Church do's not say we *Worship thee O Christ*, but *thy Cross*, when she saith, *O Crux ave spes unica*.

De Imag. Lib.
2. C. 21.

Bellarmin tells us, That *Images of Christ and Saints* are to be *Worshiped properly*, and they terminate the *Act of Worship* given 'em, as they are Consider'd in themselves, and not barely as they represent the *Exemplar*, which he proves from the *Definition* of the *Council of Nice*, and many *Reasons*.

de sacra. Ador.
& Cultu Disp.
Sec. 7.

Bernardus Pujol tells us, That the *Image* is properly and truly the *matter or Object of Adoration*, and the *Worship* is truly and properly terminated on the *Image*; And not only the *external* but the *internal Worship* is to be terminated on 'em. All which he proves from the *Definitions* of the *Councils*, and that those are *Anathematiz'd* by the *Council of Nice* that deny it; And that when the *Council of Trent* mentions the *external Acts*, it implies the *internal Worship* is terminated on the *Image*. For the *external Acts* have not the *Nature of Worship*, but as they are *signs of internal Worship*: And to say the *Worship* is terminated on the *Image improperly*, is to make the *Council* speak improperly: And he that do's so do's not only err in the *manner of speaking* but in the thing it self.

De Myst. In-
car ad Q. 25.
Dis. 4.

Umbertus tells us, that nothing can be properly wor-shiped that terminates not the worship: And the *Councils of Nice and Trent* define such a worship of *Images* as is terminated on the *Image*. And further tells us, that the *Image* may be worshipped without worshipping the *Exemplar*; because the *Acts of worshipping* both are two good *Acts*: And therefore there being no positive precept to worship 'em together, it is lawful to worship the one without the other.

De Incar. Disp.
56. Sec. 1.

Ariaga lays this down as a principle among *Catholicks*, That *Images are truly worshiped*; which (saith he) all the *Definitions of Councils* do clearly manifest; which being a *Dogmatical Point of Faith* against *Hereticks* can't without danger of *Errour* be explain'd in an *improper Sense*: And that the *Opinion of Durandus* is manifestly condemn'd

“ demn’d by all those *Definitions of Councils* which require
 “ true worship to be given to Images: And that it signi-
 “ fies nothing to their excuse that they perform the out-
 “ ward signs of worship to Images since they allow ’em no
 “ proper worship; but only account ’em helps to excite the
 “ memory. And that the *Councils* did not determine a-
 “ gainst *Hereticks* that they might be us’d as a *condition of*
 “ *worship*, (for that the *Hereticks* acknowledg’d) but that
 “ *true worship was to be given to ’em.*

De Myft. Incar.

Disp. 36. Sec.

“ *Cardinal Hugo* tells us, That to the worship of Images
 “ it is not only necessary that the *external kind of worship* 3.N.37.

“ be perform’d to the Image, as *kissing, bowing, &c.* but
 “ there must be an *inward affection* too, which implys
 “ *submission to the thing worshipped.* For (saith he) *worship* as all
 “ agree is an *Expression of submission to the thing worshipped* :
 “ And it wou’d be a ridiculous thing to say that *Peter* is
 “ *worship’d* by that *token of submission* I shew to *Paul*. There-
 “ fore to the *worship of the Image* the *outward Act* must ex-
 “ press the *inward submission of the Mind* to it; or else we
 “ must deny the common *Definition of Worship*, and make
 “ a *new one*. He also proves that the *Council of Nice* did de-
 “ cree *True and Real Worship* to be given to the *Images* as
 “ they are *distinct* from the *Exemplars*.

“ ’Tis acknowledg’d by all the *Roman Doctors* that the *Se-*
 “ *cond Council of Nice* *Anathematiz’d* all who say that *Images are*
 “ *to be had only for memory, and not for worship*; and that
 “ such as pretend to *honour Images and not to worship ’em* are
 “ *guilty of Hypocrisy.*

Pursuant to which *Decree of the Second Nicene Council*,
Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury in his *Provincial*
Synod held at *Oxford* Anno Dom. 1408, establish’t this Con-
 stitution following.

“ From henceforth let it be taught commonly and
 “ preach’t by all, that the *Cross* and the *Image of the Cru-*
 “ *cifix*, and the rest of the *Images of the Saints* (in memory
 “ and honour of him whom they figure) as also their pla-
 “ ces and *Relicks* ought to be worshipped with *Processions*,
 “ *bendings of the Knee*, *bowings of the Body*, *Purifica-*
 “ *tions*, *Deosculations*, *Oblations*, *burning of Candles*,
 “ *Pilgrimages*, together with all manner and forms what-
 “ ever as hath been accustom’d to be done in our Prede-
 “ cessors time.

This

14 *The Doctrine and Practice of Image-Worship.*

Provine. Lib.
s. tit. de hæret.
p. 160

Spelman p.
655.

This *Constitution* is extant in *Lyndwood* as a part of the *Canon Law* then in force. In the form of *Renunciation* impos'd on the *Lollards* there are these words concerning *Images*.

" I do swear to God, and all his Saints upon the Holy Gospel, that from this day forward I will worship Images, by praying and offering to 'em. This form is to be found in the *Records of the Tower*, Clause 19. k. 2.

In the *Roman Catechism* set out by the *Council of Trent* the *Parish Priest* is to command and to declare to his *Parishioners* that it is not only lawful to have *Images* in the Church, but to give honour and worship to 'em.

And tho' the *Council of Trent* has declar'd that there is no inherent power in *Images* for which they are to be worshiped; or that any thing is to be asked of 'em, or that trust is to be put in 'em (as was of old by the *Heathens* in their *Idols*) yet forasmuch as *Popes* have assum'd to themselves the *Explication* and *Interpretation* of the *Decrees of Councils*, we are to judge of the meaning of the *Decrees of Councils* from the *Practice* of the *Roman Church*, which teaches, 1. That there is an inherent Power or Vertue in *Images*, for which they are to be worship'd. 2. That they are to be prayed unto. 3. That they are to be trusted in.

1. In the first place, that the *Roman Church* do's attribute an inherent Vertue and Power to their *Images*; for which they are to be worshiped, appears from the *Prayers* they make at the *Consecration* of their *Images*.

In the *Office of Benediction* of a new *Cross* (allow'd by public Authority) there is this Prayer, *Rogamus te, Domine, Sancte Pater, Omnipotens, &c.* " We beseech thee, O Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Everlasting God, that thou woud'st vouchsafe to bless this Wood of thy Cross; that it may be a wholsom remedy to Mankind, a Strengthner of Faith, an Increaser of Good works, the redemption of Souls, a Comfort, and Protection and Defence against the Cruelty of Enemies.

In this Prayer God is implor'd to bestow sundry Vertues on the Cross: and these Vertues (being pray'd for) must be believ'd to be given to the Cross: And consequently it must be believ'd that there is an inherent Vertue and Power in the Image of the Cross for which it is to be Worshiped.

In the *Consecration* of an *Agnus Dei*, the *Pope* prays That
" God

" God wou'd vouchsafe to bless and sanctify it; that being
 " sanctify'd by his Blessing, it may receive vertue against
 " all Diabolical Crafts and Frauds, of the Evil Spirit,
 " that no Storm, or Tempest of Sea, no Pestilence or
 " Corruption of Air; no Falling Sickness nor any sin may
 " have Dominion in them, or prevail against them, that
 " devoutly carry about 'em that *Agnus Dei*. So great is
 " the holiness of an *Agnus Dei*, that none but his Holiness
 " can confer it; and not at all Times, but only in the
 " first and seventh Year of his Popedom.

Now an *Agnus Dei* must be believ'd to have all these
 Vertues in it, that the Pope has pray'd for, and Consequently
 must be believ'd to be a *preservative against the Devil,*
against Storms and Tempests; against Plagues, and Falling
Sickness, against Sin, and what not.

And that we may be *Partakers* of those *vertues* from it,
 it is requir'd that we *devoutly carry about us an Agnus Dei:* and
 Worship it, for by a following Prayer *worshiping the Agnus*
Dei is enjoyn'd as well as carrying it about us.

Whence it appears, that tho' the Council of Trent has
 (in words) told us; *that there is no inherent vertue, or Power*
in Image, for which they are to be worshiped; Yet those words
 are to be understood in a clean *contrary sense* to what the
 letter of 'em do's import, and serve only to prevent that
 scandal that words more than *Actions* are liable to.

2. That the *Roman Church* do pray and make requests to
 their *Images*, appears from a Formal Prayer it makes to
 the *Cross*. They pray to the *Cross* on bended knees on *good*
Friday in these words, *Hail, O Cross our only hope in this Pas-*
sion Time, increase Righteousness to the Godly, and give Pardon
to the Guilty.

And in the *Feast of the Invention of the Cross*, they pray
 to it, to *save the present Company assembled for its praises.*

And that not only the *Common People*, but the *Church*
 thus prays to the *Cross* as the *Image of Christ*, has been
 already prov'd from the Acknowledgment of their Learned
 Men.

3. That the *Roman Church* do put their trust in their *Images*,
 appears from the great benefit that is expected from the
 devout carrying about 'em an *Agnus Dei*; as also from that
 Prayer to the *Cross*, wherein they call it their hope, and
 beseech it to *increase righteousness to 'em, and to pardon their sins.*

That

That *Images* are to be *worshiped*, and all *External Acts* of *Adoration*, as *Bendings of the knee*, *Prostrations*, *Burning of Lights* and *Incense*, &c. is to be perform'd to 'em, all the *Roman Doctors* do agree in : but how to *terminate* the *Act of Worship*, is a *Controversy* among 'em so great and pleasant, as no *Play*, or *Bear-baiting* can make better sport (if it were proper to turn such matters into *Diversions*). Their *Arguments* against each other I wou'd acquaint the Reader with, were it not for the wast of Time and Paper, and the charge of Printing : Each Party by *unanswerable Reasons* proving the other Party to be guilty of *Idolatry*. To *terminate* the *worship of Latreia* on the *Images of God and Christ*, is concluded by many of 'em to be *Idolatry*, and to *terminate* an *Inferior worship* on 'em, is to *terminate* the *worship* on the *Images themselves*, (altho' it be given upon the *Account* of the *Prototype* or *thing represented*, and so to express *Submission* to an *Inanimate thing*) which by the greatest number of 'em is concluded to be *Idolatry*. And to *worship* the *Image* only upon the *Account* of the *Prototype*, is to *terminate* the *whole Worship* on the *Prototype* ; and so *no Worship* wou'd be given to the *Image*, (for *improper worship* (say they) is *no Worship*) which is contrary to the *Definition* of the *Council of Nice*, and to *Worship the Image for its Self*, is *contrary* to the *Decree* of the *Council of Trent*.

Here now the *Worshipper* of an *Image* is in a great freight, having no way to evade the being guilty of *Idolatry*. If he give the *same worship* that is given to the *Prototype* or *Person represented*, he is prov'd an *Idolater* by *unanswerable Reasons*, by the *Doctors* of that Church that requires *Images to be worshiped*. If he give the *Image* an *inferior worship*, or a *worship distinct* from what is given to the *Prototype* or *Person represented* ; then must the *worship* be *terminated* on the *Image*, and the *Image worshiped* for some *virtue therein inherent* ; and *submission* paid to an *inanimate thing* ; which by the greater number of the *Roman Doctors* is concluded to be *Idolatry*.

What shall the *Worshipper* of an *Image* in this case do ? I know no other possible way he has to *avoid Idolatry*, but by refusing to give *any kind of worship* thereto ; as is prov'd in the ensuing Chapters of this Discourse.

17

C H A P. III.

*Containing the First Argument against Image-Worship ;
Wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the True GOD under
any Corporeal Representation, Similitude, or Likeness
whatsoever, is forbidden in the Second Commandment, and
consequently is Idolatry.*

THAT the Worship forbidden in the Second Commandment is Idolatry, is on all sides assented to. The question betwixt the Reformed and Roman Church, is about the sense and meaning of the Command. They say, It only forbids the making and worshipping of the Images of False Gods (which they call Idols) or Representations of Imaginary Beings for worship ; and giving Sovereign worship to the Images of God and Saints.

The Reformed Churches say, that it forbids not only the making and worshipping the Images of False Gods, and Representations of Imaginary Beings, and giving Sovereign Worship to the Images of God and Saints ; but also forbids the making any kind of Representations for Worship ; Thou shalt not make (saith the Commandment) to thy self, (not only) any graven Image (but also) any likeness of any thing in Heaven or Earth, or in the Water under the Earth, to bow down thereto, or serve them. All kind of Representations for Worship can't be more expressly forbidden, than they are in this Commandment ; And not only Sovereign Worship is therein forbidden, but all kind of Religious Worship whatever. For to make this Commandment an Explication of the First Commandment, (as the Romish Church do's) and to relate only to Sovereign Worship, is in effect to make God say, you shall have no Sovereign Gods besides me, but you may have as many Inferior Gods as you please.

Two Reasons I shall here offer to prove, that in this Commandment is forbidden not only the making Images of False Gods, or of Imaginary Beings, but also any Image of the True God.

I. Because had God in this Command forbid only the

All Worship of God by an Image forbidden.

making of the *Images of False Gods*, or of *Imaginary Beings*, he wou'd have said *ye shall not make to your selves the Images of any God but me.* But God forbids the making the *likeness of any thing at all to bow down thereto*: Therefore this Command must necessarily be understood, not only to forbid the making of the *Images of False Gods*; but also *all Images and likenesses whatever* to represent the *True God* by.

Deut. 4.
15. 16.

2. Because the *Reason* that *Moses* makes use of to press the *Israelites* to the Obedience of the whole Law, (and consequently of this Command) is because *they saw no manner of Similitude of God*; and therefore cautions 'em to beware of making any *Similitude*; lest (saith he) *you corrupt your selves, by making the Similitude of any figure, the likeness of Male or Female.*

Now had God in the *Second Commandment* only forbid the making of the *Images of False Gods*, or of *Imaginary Beings* for worship; the meaning of *Moses's* words must have been; God suffer'd no *Similitude of himself* to appear to you, lest you shou'd be thereby tempted to make the *Images of False Gods*, or of *Imaginary Beings*, and worship them: Which Interpretation no Man well in his wits can admit. For had God approv'd the worshipping himself by *Images*, he wou'd have given some *Similitude* whereby to worship himself to prevent their Corrupting themselves by making the *Images of False Gods*.

Therefore forasmuch as *Moses* gives this as a *Reason* why they shou'd beware of Corrupting themselves, in making any *Similitude*, viz. Because God gave 'em no manner of *Similitude* at the Time he gave 'em the Command: It undeniably follows that God in this Command, has not only prohibited the making of the *Images of False Gods*, or proper Representations of himself, or *Images of Imaginary Beings*, but all kind of *Similitudes* whatever to represent him by, as also all manner of *likeness whatever* for Worship.

19

C H A P. IV.

*Containing a Second Argument against Image-Worship ;
Wherein is prov'd that the worshipping the True GOD, un-
der any Corporeal Representation, or Similitude whatever,
is as great Idolatry as was Aaron's and the Israelites in
Worshipping the Golden Calf, Exod. 32.*

IF Aaron's and the Israelites Idolatry consisted in *Worship-
ping the Golden Calf as a Representation of the True God ;*
then must it be Idolatry to *Worship the True God* under any
Corporeal Representation or Similitude whatever.

A *Cow* or *Ox* is a Creature serviceable to *Man*, and as
fit as any Creature to represent *God's* benefits to him: and
forasmuch as there is less danger in taking the *Image* of a
Cow, or an *Ox*, for a *God*, then there is in taking the *I-
mage* of a *Man* ; if any *Representation* be lawful, that cer-
tainly is most lawful, that infers least *Danger* to the *Wor-
shipper* ; and therefore the *Image* of a *Cow* or *Ox* is more
lawful then the *Image* of a *Man* : The *Image* of a *Man*, be-
ing also that figure the *Heathens* so much abus'd in worship-
ping their *False Gods*, was of all Figures most unfit to re-
present the *True God* by. It is agreed on all sides, that
Aaron and the *Israelites*, were guilty of *Idolatry* in making
and worshipping the *Golden Calf*, the Question only lies,
wherein did their Idolatry consist ?

The *Roman Doctors* tell us, that it consisted in *worshipping*
the *Calf* as a *God*, or as a *Representation* of some *False*
God.

The *Protestants* alledge their *Idolatry* consisted in *making*
and *worshipping* the *Calf*, as a *Representation* only of the *True*
God, or *Symbol* of his *Presence* : And hence conclude, That
to *Worship* the *True God* under any *Image* or *Representation*
whatever is *Idolatry*.

All that therefore herein is to be prov'd is, That
Aaron and the *Israelites* did not *worship* the *Golden Calf* as
a *God*, or the *Representation* of any *False God*, but only as
the *Representation* of the *True God*, or *Symbol* of his *Presence*.
And their *Reasons* in proof hereof are. Cc2 1. The

Reason 1.

1. The *Israelites* did acknowledge the *True God*, at the *Time* they made this *Calf*. The *True God* they knew brought 'em out of *Egypt*, *Establish'd* the *Passover* among 'em, destroy'd all the *First-born* of *Egypt*, divided the *Red-Sea*, overthrew the *Host* of *Pharaoh*; And a little before in *Thunder* and *Lightning*, made himself known to 'em; And at that time miraculously fed 'em with *Manna* from *Heaven*: Therefore it must be the *True God's Representation* they thereby intended.

It cannot be suppos'd, that after so great *Mercys* and *Deliverances*, and such present demonstrations of *God's Power* in the *daily* filling of their *Bellies*, any people cou'd be so blockish, as so soon after to turn *Infidels* and disown him.

Reason 2.

2. A little before *Moses* went into the *Mount*, *God* promis'd he wou'd send his *Angel* before 'em, *Exod.* 23. 20. v. which is call'd *God's Presence*, *Exod.* 33. 14 v. Some extraordinary *Symbol* of *God's Presence* to go with 'em, they therefore expected. What it was they cou'd not tell, and expecting to see *Moses* no more, they fell upon devising one: And having in *Egypt* seen *Golden Bulls* worshipped, as the *Representation* of their *Chief God Osiris*, they pitch't upon that as a *Symbol* of their *God the Lord JEHOVAH*.

Reason 3.

3. The *Reason* they give for making this *Calf*, is, because *Moses* was so long *absent* from 'em; they knew not what was become of him; they express not the least *Infidelity* as the Cause thereof: They don't say, they knew not what was become of the *God that brought 'em out of the Land of Egypt*, and gave 'em the *Law*: but only out of distrust of *Moses* his returning any more to instruct 'em, they fell into this *Error*.

Reason 4.

4. When the *People* became sensible of their sin; they mourned, and no *Man* put on his *Ornaments*, *Exod.* 33. 4 v. which Evidences that they retain'd the knowledge of the *True God*, in that they were so soon after sorry for offending him; and that *Infidelity* was not the cause of making this *Calf*.

Reason 5.

5. They call'd the *Calf* the *God that brought 'em out of the Land of Egypt*, therefore they must intend thereby his *Representation*, who a little before told 'em he was the *God that brought 'em thence*: For they cou'd not be so senseless, as to believe that their own *Gold* made into fashion of a *Calf*, cou'd have wrought those wonders which they had seen. No people in the world were ever so void of understanding

as

as to believe the *Workmanship* of their own hands wrought miracles before they themselves gave it a Being.

6. After Aaron had complied with 'em in making this Calf, they proclaim'd a Feast to the Lord JEHOVAH; There- Reason 6.
fore it must be the Lord Jehovah's Representation that was thereby intended. Surely Aaron wou'd never have given the incommunicable Name of JEHOVAH to a Calf of his own making; had he not intended it for a Representation of him. JEHOVAH was a peculiar Name, that God was known by to the People of Israel, upon the Accomplishment of his Promise in bringing 'em out of the Land of Egypt, *Exod. 6. 3. 6.* Now when the people cry'd, *these* *Exod. 32. 5.*
are thy Gods that brought thee out of Egypt; Aaron proclaim'd a Feast to JEHOVAH, that is, The True God that brought 'em thence, which clearly proves, he made that Calf as a Symbol of the Lord JEHOVAH.

7. Either the Israelites must worship this Calf as the Representation of the True God, or believing it to be a God, or the Representation of some False God.

That they did not Worship this Calf as believing it to be a GOD, has been prov'd; They had been now a long time under God's Instruction, and therefore can't be suppos'd to be so grossly ignorant, as to believe the *workmanship* of their own hands to be a God. Moreover they call'd this Calf the God that brought 'em out of Egypt; Therefore they must Worship it as a Representation of some God, either True or False: For it's not possible they cou'd be so senseless as to believe their own Gold, made by themselves into the fashion of a Calf, could be a God, and not only a God, but a God that brought 'em out of Egypt, before it had a Being.

If this Calf was worshiped by 'em as the Representation of any False God it must be either some Egyptian God, or the God of some other Nation; it cou'd not be of any Egyptian God, which I prove by two undeniable Reasons.

1. Because when they made this Calf they proclaim'd a *Exod. 32. 5.*
Holy Feast to JEHOVAH, and offer'd *Burnt-Offerings* and *Peace-Offerings*. Now what their *Burnt-Offerings* and *Peace-Offerings* were, are express'd *Exod. 20. 24, and 24. 5. v. viz. Oxen and Sheep*, which *Sacrifices* were an Abomination to the Egyptians, and never offer'd by 'em to any God of their's.

We are told by *Plutarch* and *Strabo*, that an Ox was the Image of the Egyptian God *Osiris*, and therefore so sacred among

Athen. lib. 7.

Lib. 2.
cap. 41.

mong 'em, that it was not *lawful* so much as to *hurt* an *Ox*. And *Anaxandrides* in *Athenæus* saith, that a *Greek* cou'd have no conversation with an *Egyptian*, because the *One* worship'd an *Ox*, which the *Other* Sacrific'd. And *Herodotus* tells us, that the *Egyptians* wou'd not so much as *touch* the *Knife* or *Spit*, or *Pot*, that the *Greeks* had us'd; so great was their *Enmity* towards those that did either *Eat* or *Sacrifice* those *Creatures* which they worship'd as *Representations* of their *Gods*.

And this *Reason* *Moses* gives *Exod. 8. 26.* why he desir'd to go into the *Wilderness* to *Sacrifice*; for (saith he) *shall we Sacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians before their Eyes, and will they not Stone us?* As much as to say, we must *Sacrifice Oxen* which the *Egyptians* *Worship*, and if we *kill* the things they *worship* before themselves, they will *Stone* us.

Now had the *Israelites* fall'n into the *Idolatri* of the *Egyptians*, they wou'd never have offer'd such *Sacrifices* to the *Calf* as were an *Abomination* to the *Egyptians* and such as they were accusom'd to offer to *JEHOVAH*.

2. They call'd the *Calf* the *God* that brought 'em out of *Egypt*, therefore it must be his *representation* to whom they ascrib'd their miraculous deliverance out of *Egypt*. Now to the *Egyptian Gods* they cou'd not ascribe their miraculous deliverance out of *Egypt*; for then they must have concluded the *Egyptian Gods* *destroyers* of the *Nation* that worship'd em, in favour of *themselves* who were *Enemies* to 'em. Moreover they here make use of the preface of the *Law* which *God* had lately given 'em upon *Mount Sinai*, viz. *I am the Lord that brought thee out of Egypt*: which *Preface* we don't find us'd in any *Idolatri* the *Israelites* fell into, save only this, and that of *Jeroboam*; which was of the same *Nature* with this; which proves this *Worship* had no *Relation* to the *Egyptian Gods*.

And that this *Calf* cou'd not be worship'd by the *Israelites* as the *Representation* of the *God* of any other *Nation* is manifest from the two following *Reasons*.

1. Because they were not yet acquainted with the way of *worship* us'd by other *Nations*, and knew not their *Gods*.

2. When they fell into the *Idolatri* of other *Nations*, the *Names* of the *False Gods* they worshiped are set down in *Scripture*

Scripture, as of *Baal-Peor*, *Moloch*, *Rempham*. It's a very observable Difference the Scripture makes betwixt the worship of False Gods, and Representations of the true God. In the former the Names are always exprest in Scripture; thus in *Solomon's Idolatry*, the Names of False Gods he worshiped, are in Scripture mention'd, viz. *Astaroth*, the Goddess of the *Zidonians*, *Chemosh* the God of the *Moabites*; and *Milcom* the God of the Children of *Ammon*; and in *Ahab's Idolatry* it's said he worship'd *Baal*: But in this Idolatry and that of *Jeroboams* (being the same with this) the Similitude is only nam'd which clearly proves that this Idolatry was distinct from other Idolatrys, as being the worship only of what they set up for a Representation of the True God.

Bellarmino tells us from *Abulensis*, *Cajetan*, and others; that the *Israelites* had two sorts of Idols, one without a Name, as the Idol of *Micah*, and it may be (saith he) the Golden Calf that *Aaron* made and *Jeroboam* renew'd, for the Scripture doth not call it *Moloch* or *Baal*, &c. The other had a Name, as *Moloch*, *Astaroth*, *Chemosh*: therefore (saith he) it may not improbably be allow'd of the first Sort, that the Jews did worship the True God in the Idol.

Hence observe (that according to *Bellarmino*) the Image of the True God may be an Idol and the Worshipper an Idolater.

Bellarmino gives the Reasons why the Children of Israel sin'd grievously in making this Calf.

1. Because they Sacrific'd to it, to which it's answer'd, that they Sacrific'd to it only as a Representation of God, or Symbol of his Presence, which is as lawful as to prostrate ourselves and pray to Images; For if there be any kind of Sacrifice peculiar to God it is the Sacrifice of Prayer.

2. *Bellarmino* tells us they believ'd the Divinity to be in the Calf. — Answer. And so do such Papists as believe Images can speak, move their heads, twinkle with their Eyes and Distill tears, Yea, and work miracles (which is a Common thing with some Images in Spain and Italy). But it do's not Appear by any thing we read in Scripture that the *Israelites* believ'd the Divinity to be either in this Calf, or in those which *Jeroboam* did Erect: But intended 'em only for naked Symbols whereby to worship God.

3. *Bellarmino* saith, the *Israelites* thought God to be Corporeal.

porcal like the Idol. — Answer. Then must they have thought the Lord JEHOVAH to be just of the fashion of a Calf, and become more ridiculous than the *Anthropomorphites*. These are *ungrounded Conjectures* and *Contrivances* of Men's Brains to make the *Israelites natural fools* and *senseless sots*, that they may have something to say in their own defence to free themselves from the Charge of *Idolatry*.

Having now Acquainted my Reader with some of those *Reasons* that are insisted on by learned *Protestants* to prove that *Aaron's Calf* was worshiped by the *Israelites* only as a *Representation* of the *True God*; I shall now proceed to Acquaint him with such *reasons* as are urg'd by the *Roman Doctors* to prove the Contrary.

1. In the first place, They Argue from *Exod. 32. 4 v.* were the *Israelites* call the Calf the *Gods that brought 'em out of Egypt*, therefore (say they) they cou'd not intend thereby a *Representation* of the *True God*, there being but *one True God*.

Answer. To put the *Plural* number for the *singular* is an *Hebraism* usual in Scripture. In *Neh. 9. 18 v.* the *Levites* in making Confession of this sin express it in the singular number, *They made them a molten Calf, and said this is the God that brought thee out of Egypt.*

2. They Argue from *Deut. 32. 28 v.* where the *Israelites* are said to be *a people void of Council and Understanding*, and therefore might take the *Image* of a Calf to be a *God*.

Answer. They are said to be *A people void of Council and Understanding*, because they were not so wise as to Consider their latter end, and live accordingly; as appears by the following verse: And such as lead wicked lives are charg'd in Scripture with want of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding.

What means of knowledge the *Israelites* had in *Egypt* the Scripture is silent in. We read not that they were oppressed till they became exceeding numerous: but suppose 'em an Ignorant People when they left *Egypt*, yet before they committed this *Idolatry* they must be a People of Competent knowledge. They had seen many wonders wrought by God in their Deliverance and Preservation, they were under the Government of a wise and learned *Moses*, by whom they were Instructed in their Duty; as also by God himself who spake to 'em from Heaven when he

he deliver'd the Decalogue to 'em; And therefore can't be suppos'd thro' Ignorance to be guilty of such Prodigious folly as to believe *the workmanship of their own hands*, not only to be a God, but a God that wrought *Miracles in their deliverance out of Egypt, before it did exist*: Such Apprehensions must make 'em the most *Irrational Idolaters* that ever lived in the World.

3. They argue from *Acts 7. 39 v.* where St. Stephen speaking of this *Idolatory* saith, *Our Fathers wou'd not obey but thrust him from them, and in their Hearts turn'd back into Egypt, saying, make us Gods to go before us.* Hence they infer that the *Israelites* thrust the True God from them, 2. That in their Hearts they return'd to *Egypt*, that is, to the *Egyptian Idolatry*, and consequently worship'd the *Calf* as a *Representation* of some *Egyptian God*.

Answer. 1. These words of St. Stephen (and *thrust him from them*) are not to be understood of *God* but only of *Moses*.

2. Suppose the *Israelites* had return'd to the *Egyptian Idolatry*, it wou'd not thence follow that the *Calf* shou'd not be worship'd as a *Representation* of the True God: for the *Egyptians* themselves intended the worship of the True God under their *Symbolical Representations*. The words of St. Stephen (that *in their hearts they turned back into Egypt*) are to be understood only of the *manner of their worship*; that is to say, that they fell to worship such a *Representation of God* as they had seen in greatest Veneration among the *Egyptians*.

4. They Argue from *Deut. 32, 15, 16, 17 v.* where the *Israelites* are said to *have forgotten God and to have Sacrific'd to Devils*, therefore they worship'd not the *Calf* as a *Representation* of the True God.

Answer. God punish'd this *Idolatry* of the *Calf* by permitting them to fall into other *Idolatrys*, as that of *Baal-Peor Numb. 25. 3 v.* on Account of which *Idolatry* they are said to have *Sacrific'd to Devils*: or the words may be understood as a *Prophecy* of those *Idolatrys* they afterwards fell into.

5. They argue from *Psal : 106. 21 v.* where (speaking of this *Idolatry of the Calf*) they are said to *forget God their Saviour which had done great wonders in Egypt*.

Answer God is said in Scripture to be *forgotten* by us,

D d

when

when we break his Commandments. Deut. 8. 11. 14. and 6. 12. v. Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God in not keeping his Commandments, and his Statutes, which I command thee this Day. Now the making this Calf being a violation of the Second Commandment, they are said to forget God, because guilty of so open a breach of it.

6. They Argue from Psal. 106. and Acts 7. 41. in which Scriptures the Calf is call'd a *Molten Image*, and an *Idol*, and therefore cou'd not be a *Representation* of the *True God*.

Answer. All *Corporeal Representations* being *Worship'd*, become *Idols*; tho' they are *worship'd* in *subordination* to God: because God will have no *Communicability* in his *Worship*. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, or before my Face, Exod. 20. 3 v. in that *Act* of *Worship* wherein God is an *Object*, nothing must be an *Object* but God; nothing must come betwixt God and the *Act* of *Worship* as an *Object* of that *Act*; whether by way of *Subordination* to God, or *Representation* of him: If it do's, God disowns the *Act* of *worship*, and places it on that *Object* that is *Ador'd* together with, in *Subordination* to himself, and so it becomes a *God* before the face of God. And for this Reason the Calf is call'd an *Idol*, and a *Molten Image*; and so are all *Representations* whatever that come betwixt God and the *Act* of *Worship* directed to him. They are *Gods* before the face of God, and therefore *Idols*, and their *Worshippers* *Idolaters*. There can't be two *Objects* of the same *Act* of *Worship*, as shall be hereafter prov'd.

CHAP. V.

Containing a Third Argument against Image-Worship; Wherein is prov'd that the Worshipping the True GOD under any Corporeal Representation or Similitude, is as great Idolatry as was Jeroboam's and the Ten Tribes in Worshipping the Calves at Dan and Bethel.

THAT Jeroboam and the Ten Tribes were guilty of Idolatry in Worshipping the Calves at Dan and Bethel is on all sides Acknowledg'd.

The Question only is whether their Idolatry consisted in worshipping those Calves as Gods or Representations of False Gods, or as Representations only of the True God.

The Roman Doctors affirm the former, the Protestants asserts the latter; hence concluding that the worshipping any Image or Corporeal Representation of the True God is Idolatry. Their Reasons in proof hereof are as follows.

Reason 1. Because Jeroboam Acknowledges, 1 Kings 12. 26. 27. 28 v. that the Reason why he Erected those Calves was, lest the people shou'd go up to the House of the Lord in Jerusalem to Sacrifice, and thereby be prevail'd on to return to their Lord, even to Rehoboam King of Judah. Whereupon he took Council, and made two Calves of Gold, and said to 'em, it is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem, behold thy Gods O Israel which brought thee out of Egypt.

To keep the People from going up to Jerusalem to Worship God (lest thereby they shou'd return to the house of David) is the Reason here given why Jeroboam Erected those Calves. He pretends he did it for the People's Ease, to save 'em the trouble of going to a place so remote as Jerusalem was to worship God.

Had Jeroboam design'd to introduce the worship of False Gods, in all probability he had lost himself in the Affection of all the Israelites that were Worshippers of the True God. Jeroboam was too great a Polititian to change the Object of their Worship on a sudden, from the True God to False Gods; and that too before himself was settled in the Kingdom.

Jeroboam's Golden Calves worshipp'd.

Therefore it must be concluded that he Erected those *Calves* as *Representations* of the *True God*, that by giving them these *Symbols* of the *Divine Presence* by which to worship God in his own *Territorys*, he might keep 'em from going to *Jerusalem* to worship him there.

Ant. Jud.

Lib. 3. c. 3.

Josephus tells us, that in the Speech of *Jeroboam* made to the People, he only pleaded that God being every where, might be worship'd at *Dan* and *Bethel* as well as at *Jerusalem*, and that for their greater conveniency he set up the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*, that thereby they might *Worship God*.

Secondly. *Jeroboam* in Erecting these *Calves* pretends to magnify the *True God*; behold (saith he) *thy Gods* (or *thy God Elohim*) *O Israel that brought thee out of Egypt*. He useth the same *Preface* that God annexed to the *Commandments*, which is not in *Scripture* us'd to any but the *True God*.

Thirdly. These *Calves* must be Erected by *Jeroboam*, either as *Gods*, or *Representations of False Gods*, or *Representations of the True God*.

1. They cou'd not be Erected by him as *Gods*, for the *Reasons* mention'd in the former *Argument*; The *Israelites* at this time were one of the most *Famous Nations* in the *World*, and not *Inferior* to any *Nation* for *Wisdom*, and *Knowledge*: Yea, exceeded all *Nations* in the *knowledge* of the *True God*; and therefore can't be suppos'd to believe the *Workmanship of Men's Hands*, to be the *God that brought 'em out of Egypt*, so many *hundred Years* before it had a being (as was before observ'd).

2. If *Jeroboam* had Erected these *Calves* as *Representations of False Gods*, he must Erect 'em as *Representations of the Egyptian Gods*, or the *Gods of some other Nation*.

1. Not of the *Egyptian False Gods*. In proof whereof the *Reasons* in the former *Argument* may be here Apply'd. He call'd 'em the *Gods* (or the *God*) that brought 'em out of *Egypt*: Therefore he cou'd not mean thereby the *False Gods of the Egyptians*. For both he and the *People* well knew it was not their *False Gods* that brought 'em thence; but that it was *JEHOVAH* that deliver'd 'em from that *Bondage*. And to have us'd the same *Preface* that God had affix'd to the *Commandments* wou'd have prov'd a great hindrance to their *Worshipping the False Gods* of the

the Egyptians had he design'd their Worship by those Calves.

Moreover we read 1 Kings 12. 32 v. that Jeroboam appointed a Feast like to that of Judah, and Sacrific'd to the Calves that he had made, (that is to say) according to the Custom of the Jewish Sacrifices; which Custom afterwards the Ten Tribes continu'd to the Time of their Captivity, 2 Kings 17. 22 v. Therefore it cou'd not be the Egyptian Idolatry that he introduced in those Calves. Nor wou'd the Priests appointed for the Service of those Calves be Consecrated with a Sacrifice of a Young Bullock and Seven Rams, 2 Chron. 13. 9 v. had he intended thereby the Introducing of the Egyptian Idolatry; for such a Sacrifice, according to the Rites of the Egyptian Idolatry, wou'd have profan'd the most Sacred Person.

2. In the second place, That Jeroboam Erected not those Calves as Representations of the False Gods of any other Nation will appear from the two following Reasons. 1. Because in the Worshipping of False Gods or their Representations, the Scripture always makes mention of their Names as has been shewn in the former Argument. But in this Idolatry as also of that of Micah's; which was of the same Nature Judges 17: with this (consisting in the Worshipping the True God in a Teraphim or Image of a Man) the Similitude only is nam'd.

Secondly. Because Ahab's sin in Worshipping Baal is in Scrip- 1. Kings 16. ture aggravated above Jeroboam's in Worshipping the Calves. 31. 32 v. And it came to pass (saith the Scripture speaking of Ahab) as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, that he took to Wife Jezebel the Daughter of Ethbaal King of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal, and Worshipped him.

In this Scripture we find that Ahab's sin in Worshipping Baal, is aggravated above Jeroboam's in Worshipping the Calves; which cou'd not be if the Calves, had been Worship'd as Gods or Representations of False Gods; for then there wou'd have been no difference betwixt the Worship of them, and Baal; the Idolatry had been Alike, and the guilt equal.

There was in Ahab's time two sorts of Publick Worship among the Ten Tribes; viz. That of the Calves, and that of Baal, which Ahab brought in: To which the Generality of the People cleav'd, in compliance with their King:

or

or rather (as that which is most probable) they sometimes *Worship'd the Calves*, and at other times *Worship'd Baal*, which seems to be the *Reason of Elijah's words*, 1 Kings, 18. 21 v. *How long will ye halt between two Opinions, if the Lord be God follow him, if Baal follow him?*

Elijah was no approver of their *Worshipping the Calves*, yet calls such as worship'd 'em, *Worshippers of the True God*, (that is to say) *comparatively so*, or so in respect of the *Worshippers of Baal*; who thereby renounc'd the *True God*. And therefore he opposes 'em to the *Worshippers of Baal*; and tells the People (who were but newly allur'd to that *Idolatry*) that if they *worship'd Baal* they must utterly *renounce the True God*. Whereby it is most Evident, that the *Calves* were not worshipp'd as *Representations of False Gods*; but was the only *Publick Worship of the True God* that was among the *Ten Tribes*, which the new *Idolatry of Baal* had almost *Extinguish't*.

A *Fourth Reason* proving that *Jeroboam's Calves* were worship'd by the *Ten Tribes*, only as *Representations of the True God*, is, because that *Jehu*, who soon after succeeded *Ahab* in the *Throne*; out of his *Zeal for the Lord Jehovah*, put to death all the *Worshippers of Baal*, and destroy'd *Baal* out of *Israel*; And yet this *Jehu*, (who appear'd and glory'd in his being so *Zealous for the True God*) departed not from the sins of *Jeroboam*; but worshipp'd the *Golden Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* v. 29th. which undeniably proves that the *Calves* were worshipp'd only as *Representations of the True God*.

Fifthly and Lastly. When the *Ten Tribes* were *Captives* in *Assyria*, and other remote Places, and *Samaria* Planted with other Nations, who desired to be instructed in the manner of *Worship* us'd by the former *Inhabitants*, the *King of Assyria* commanded that one of the *Israelitish Priests* shou'd be sent thither, to teach 'em the manner of the God of the Land, who accordingly came and dwelt at *Bethel*, and taught 'em how they shou'd fear the Lord: Which proves that the *True God* was fear'd by the *Ten Tribes*; tho' the *Calves* were worship'd by 'em, and that it was the *Representation of the True God* they intended, in the *worshipping of the Calves*.

Having now acquainted my Reader with some of those *Reasons* that are insisted on by learn'd *Protestants*, to prove that

2 Kings 10.
16. 17. 18. 19.
20. 21. 22. 23.
24 v.

2 Kings 17.
27. 28 v.

that *Jeroboam's* and the *Ten Tribes Idolatry*, consisted in worshipping the *True God* under the *Representation of a Calf*, (that is to say) a *Cow*, or *Ox*, a Creature serviceable to *Man*, and as fit as any other Creature to represent him by (as shall be hereafter prov'd). I come now to consider what is urg'd by the *Roman Doctors* to prove the Contrary.

And I find only one Text of Scripture by them insisted on, viz. *2 Chron. 11. 15 v.* Where it's said, *that Jeroboam ordain'd him Priests for the High Places, and for Devils, and for the Calves which he had made*: hence concluding that these *Calves* were made for *Representations of False Gods, or Devils*.

Answer. This Text only proves, that *Jeroboam* did allow of several other kind of *Idolatries* among the *Ten Tribes*, besides that of the *Calves*: And that some *Priests* were ordain'd for the *Worship of False Gods*, and some for the *Worship of the True God*. For there were many *Israelites* that cleav'd to *Solomon's Idolatry*, and worship'd *Chemosh the Abomination of the Moabites*, and *Astaroth the Abomination of the Zidonians*, and *Milcom the Abomination of the Children of Ammon*. *Jeroboam* (that he might secure these *Idolaters*) acted the part of a wicked *Politician*, in giving *Liberty of Conscience* to 'em; appointing 'em *Priests* and *High Places* for *Worship*. But the *worship of the Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* was the *Publick Establish'd Worship*.

*2. Kings 23.
13. v.*

The Conclusion is, that if *Aaron* and the *Israelites*, *Jeroboam* and the *Ten Tribes* were guilty of *Idolatry* in *Worshipping the True God*, under any *Representation of an Ox* (as lawful a figure to represent him by as any whatever, as shall be hereafter more fully prov'd) then must all such as *worship the True God*, under any *Corporeal Representation whatever*, be guilty of *Idolatry*; but the former is prov'd, Ergo the latter must follow by undeniable Consequence. And consequently all such *Roman Catholicks* as *Worship God* under the *Figure of a Man*, are therein guilty of *Idolatry*.

C H A P. VI.

*Containing a Fourth Argument against Image-Worship ;
Wherein is prov'd, that to Worship the True God under any
Corporeal Similitude or Representation whatever, is as great
Idolatry, as what St. Paul charges the Athenians with,
Acts, 17.*

WE read Acts, 17. 16. v. That St. Paul when he was at Athens, his Spirit was stirr'd within him, when he saw the City wholly given to Idolatry. The Question betwixt the Reformed and Roman Church, is, wherein did the Idolatry of the Athenians consist ?

Protestants say, it consisted in making Representations of the True God for Worship, and prove it from the Apostles words, v. 23. where he tells 'em that whom they ignorantly worshipp'd, he declar'd unto 'em, viz. The God that made the World and all things therein.

The God St. Paul declar'd to 'em was the God whom they ignorantly Worshipp'd : The True God St. Paul declar'd to 'em, therefore it was the True God whom they ignorantly Worshipp'd. Therefore the Idolatry St. Paul reproves and Endeavours to convert 'em from, was the Worshipping the True God, under Images of Silver and Gold, and Stone Graven by Art, or Man's Device.

The Answer the Roman Docters hereto give is, that the Idolatry of the Athenians consisted in thinking their Representations to be like the True God.

Re ply 1. This do's not appear from any word spoke here by the Apostle ; for he never reason'd with 'em about their thought of God, it was not their Affirming the Divinity to be like their Images that mov'd him, but as soon as he saw their Images his Spirit was stirr'd within him. And their Impiety and unreasonableness in worshipping the True God by Images is all that he argues there against : Nor do's it appear that the Athenians did think their Images to be like the Divinity, for they acknowledg'd the God they Worshipp'd to be unknown v 23. and if unknown, how cou'd they think him to be like themselves ?

The

The Apostle Argues not against the *Object* of their Worship, but only against the *Manner*; Telling 'em, that *God* being *Infinite*, dwelleth not in *Temples made with Hands*; neither is worship'd with *Men's Hands*, (that is, with *Representations made by the Hands of Men*;) Because every *Representation* must infer a *Resemblance* betwixt the *Image* and *Person Represented*; and therefore because we ought not to think the *God-head* to be like *Silver* or *Gold*, or *Stone* *Graven by Art*, or *Man's Device*, it ought not to be thereby *Represented*.

Reply 2. If the *Athenian Idolatry* did consist in their thinking their *Representations* to be like to the true *God*, then must it follow, that the *Scriptures* shou'd only forbid us, to think any *Image* to be like to *God*, or able perfectly to represent him to us: or to *Paint* the *Images* of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as they are in their proper *Substance* and *Essence*. And consequently allow of all possible *Representations* of *God*, and forbid only such as are impossible to be made, and never were attempted to made by any *People* in the *World*. For the *Anthropomorphites* themselves did not believe any *Image* cou'd perfectly represent *God*: And many of 'em held it unlawful to *Represent God* by the *Workmanship* of an *Artificer* who did ascribe *Corporeity* to him.

When *Moses* caution'd the *Israelites*, *Deut. 4. 16 v.* not to *Corrupt themselves by making the Similitude* of any *Figure*: did he forewarn 'em only of making proper likenesses of *God*, or to *Represent God* in his *Proper Essence* or *Person*? Did he prohibit 'em only from attempting to make such *Images* as might perfectly represent the *Divine Nature*? No certainly, for to restrain the prohibition to the making perfect *Likenesses* of *God* is both against the *Reason* of the prohibition (because *God* gave 'em no manner of *Similitude*) as also against the common *Reason* of *Mankind*: because it is impossible to make any proper *Likeness* of *God*, and consequently *Moses* shou'd have caution'd 'em against *Impossibilities*.

It must be therefore the representing *God* by any *Figure* or *Similitude* whatever, that *Moses* cautions the *Israelites* against. And *St. Paul* here shews the *Impiety* of that, which *Damasce*n (one of the first *Writers* in behalf of *Images*) calls the highest *Madness* and *Impiety*.

Orthodox.
Fidei Lib. 4.
cap. 15.

Orat. de Imagin.

And elsewhere the same Author tells us, that if we can't Paint the Soul, how much less can we Paint God by an Image, who gave that being to the Soul that can't be Painted? What Image can be made of him who is *Invisible, Incorporeal, without Quantity, Magnitude, or Form?*

We make no Images (saith Pope Gregory the Second in an Epistle to the Emperor Leo) of God, *because it is impossible to describe him; but if we had seen or known him as we have his Son, we might have Painted or Represented him as well as his Son.*

Epist. ad Joh. Synod. in Aet. 4.
2. Cono. Nice.
p. 291.

We make no Image of the *Invisible Deity* (whom the Highest Orders of Angels are not able to comprehend) says Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople. Who is there in their Senses (saith Stephanus Junior) that would go about to Paint the *Divine Nature* which is *Immaterial and Incomprehensible*? For if we can't represent him in our minds, how much less can we Paint him in Colours? These Four viz. *Damascen, Pope Gregory II, Germanus, and Stephanus Junior* were the First and Chiefest Champions, that ever wrote in Defence of Image-Worship; who, notwithstanding acknowledge that the Making of any Image of God the Father, and Trinity, is *Madness and Impiety.*

And the Second Council of Nice (which first Establish't Image-Worship) did declare, that there was no ground to make any Image of God, before the Incarnation of Christ; but since he appear'd in the Human Nature, there was (say they) no *Incongruity to Represent him by an Image.*

Bib. Patr. Gr.
Lin. Tom. 1.
p. 737.

And the Author of the use of Images (according to the Sense of the Second Nicene Council) tells us, That it was the Sense of that Council, that no Images are to be made of God; And if any Man go about it he is to suffer Death as a Pagan. Whereby observe that the Second Council of Nice (that first Establish't Image-Worship) did account it no less then Paganism, to make Images of God the Father, and of the Trinity: All which we find practic'd in the Roman Church, to the great Dishonour of God, and that Sacred Mystery.

The Roman Church in Vindication of their Practices herein, rely only on the Authority of the Council of Trent, grounded on such Appearances as God has been pleas'd to make of himself Recorded in the Old Testament.

And to the aforesaid Testimonies, the Roman Doctors Reply,

Reply, That they relate only to such *Images*, as are sup-
pos'd to *Represent the Divinity as it is in it self*; and that on-
ly against such *Images* the *Council of Nice* declar'd.

The *Reason* which *Protestant Divines* give, why this can't be
that *Council's* meaning is, because that *Council* declar'd it to
be *unlawful* to make any *Image of God*, before the *Incarna-
tion of Christ*: And ground the present *lawfulness* of ma-
king an *Image of Christ* only on his *Incarnation*. From whence
it appears that *Council* thought it not lawful to make any
Image of God from the *manner* of his *Appearances* Recorded
in the *Old Testament*; for then they must have thought it
as *lawful* to make it before *Christ's Incarnation* as after.

The *Second Council of Nice* concluded, that no meer *Appear-
ance* of *God* was sufficient to make an *Image of God*, the
reason they give is, because if it be a meer *Appearance*, the
Representation is made only of the *Appearance*, and not of
the *Person*; who never by any *Personal Union* assum'd that
likeness wherein it did appear.

But forasmuch as the *Human Nature of Christ*, was
Personally united to the *Godhead*, they Judg'd it lawful to
make a *Representation* of him, by an *Image of his Human
Nature*. It was therefore the *Assumption of Christ's Human
Nature* that made the *Council* conclude the *Lawfulness* of
making an *Image of Christ*. And consequently the *Reason*
of their forbidding the making of *Images of the Father*,
was, because he was never *Personally united* to such *Forms*,
wherein he is pretended to appear.

For which *Reason* they concluded it not only *unlawful* to
attempt the *Representing the Divinity as it is in it self*; but
also to *Represent God* by any *appearance made by him*.

And if it were *unlawful* to make any *Representations* of
God from his *pretended appearances* before the *Incarnation*
of *Christ*; it must be still *unlawful*. For no *Reason* can be
given to prove it more lawful to *Represent God* by *appearan-
ces* made by him since the *Incarnation of Christ*, then
it was before.

And it's not to be doubted, had the *Council of Nice* disal-
low'd only such *Images*, as were made to *Represent the Di-
vinity as it is in it self*; they wou'd have explain'd their
meaning and given caution to that Purpose; And told us
how *images of God* might be lawfully us'd and how not. But
that *Council* declar'd in General Terms against all *Images of*

God, as *unlawful*; which to forward a Council for advancing *Image-Worship* wou'd not have done, had they found out any reasonable pretence, for making *Images of God and of the Trinity*, as is at present *practic'd* in the *Roman Church*. Moreover if only such *Images of God* are *unlawful*, as are made to *Represent the Deity as it is in it self*, then must the Sin lye only in the *Imagination* of such Persons as make such *Images*: For that no *Image* can really do it, is on all sides acknowledg'd. And that no *Image* can more do it then the *Image of a Man* can't be deny'd, therefore the *Representing God under the Image of a Man*, must be the most *unlawful way* of *Representing* him that can be devis'd.

And if the *Ignorant Worshipper of this Image*, shou'd *Imagin* any *Real Likeness* in this *Image* to the *Divinity* (which many *Thousands* it's to be fear'd do in the *Roman Church*) yet he shou'd be excusable, because the *Image* was not made for that *End*: and the *Maker* of that *Image* intended not that it shou'd be a *proper Representation of the Deity*. And consequently none can sin but the *Person* that made the *Image* with *intention to Represent the Deity thereby as it is in it self*, which no *Heathen Statuary* or *Painter* was ever so *Mad* and *Senseless* as to pretend to do.

No *Painter* ever yet pretended to *Paint the Essence* of things. All the most exquisite *Pencils* can do, is to *Represent* things according to their sensible *Appearances*; Therefore if it be lawful to *Represent God*, as he is pretended to have *appear'd*, it must be lawful to make all such *Representations* of him as are possible to be made (which is forbidden by the *Second Nicene Council*). And questionless had *God* intended to have *himself Represented* from his *Appearances*, he wou'd have given *some kind of Appearance* to the *Israelites* to represent him by, when he gave them the *Law*: And his giving 'em *no Similitude* (with *Moses's* Caution founded thereon) Evidently demonstrates that he will not have *himself Represented* from any *Appearance* tho' made by himself.

Moreover the *Roman Church* make *Representations of God* the *Father* as he is a *Person of the Trinity* distinct from the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*. And whatever *Representation* represents him *as such*, must represent him *as he is in himself*, and not barely in regard of a *Temporal* and *Visible Appearance*.

But suppose it be lawful to represent *God* in these *Outward*

ward *Forms* wherein he has appear'd, how can the *Worshipping* of such *Forms* be excus'd from *Idolatry*? For the *Apparition* is not *God* but a *Creature*: An Effect only of *Divine Power*. It is acknowledg'd by all Learned *Romanists*, that the *Divine Person* was never *Personally united* to those *Forms*, in which it appear'd. Therefore to give *Divine Worship* to those *Forms*, is to give *Divine Worship* to the *Creature*; And if it be *unlawful* to give *Divine Worship* to those *Forms*, being *Creatures*, then must it be much more *unlawful* to give *Divine Worship* to the *Images* of those *Forms*, which are but *Images* of the *Creature*, and at best but the *Creature's Creature*.

St. *Austin* tells us, that the *Humanity of Christ* is only capable of *Receiving Adoration* from us, as it is *Hypostatically united* to the *Divine Nature*: And being consider'd as separated from it, is no more to be *Worshipped*, then the *Robe* or *Diadem* of a *Prince*, when it lyes on the *Ground*. And if the *Human Nature of Christ* is not Capable of *Adoration*, but as *united to the Divine*, much less can a *Crucifix* or an *Image of Christ's Human Nature* that was never *united thereto*, unless in the *Imagination* of the *Worshipper*, who may *Worship any other Creature* on the same grounds as well as an *Image*. But to *Worship the Images* of those *Forms* wherein *God has Appear'd* is to *Worship the Images* of such *Creatures* as never had any *Personal Union* to *God*, which is more *inexcusable Idolatry* then to *Worship the Image of Christ's Human Nature*.

And therefore the *Second Council of Nice* had good reason to conclude that before the *Second Person of the Trinity* assum'd *Man's Nature* by a *Personal Union*, it was *unlawful* to represent *God* by an *Image*, and therefore much more *unlawful* to give *Divine Worship* to such *Representations*.

C H A P. VII.

Containing a Fifth Argument against Image-Worship ; Wherein is prov'd that to Worship the True GOD under any Corporeal Representation, Likeness, or Similitude whatever, is as great Idolatry as what St. Paul charges the wiser Heathens with, Rom. 1. 18, 19, 20, 21 v.

THE *Apostle* tells us in the first Chapter of his *Epistle* to the *Romans*, that to the wiser Heathens God's *Eternal Power and Godhead* was manifested ; and yet these Persons that knew God, glorified him not as God, but became vain in their *Imaginations*. And the Reason why they glorify'd him not as God, he gives in verse 23. viz. *Because they chang'd the glory of the Incorruptible God, into an Image made like to Corruptible Man, and to Birds and four-footed Beasts and Creeping things, that is, they Represented their glorious Maker by Images of Corruptible things, and therefore are said not to glorify God but to hold the Truth in Unrighteousness.*

Hence it appears that to represent God in an Image is not to glorify him as God, and consequently to worship such Image, is not to worship God, but to hold the truth in unrighteousness.

Answ.

The *Roman Doctors* tell us that the *Apostle* here condemns the *Heathen Philosophers*, for worshipping their Images as Gods, or Representations of False Gods, or as perfect Resemblances of the True God, which the *Roman Church* abhors.

Reply.

Reply, That the *Apostle* do's not charge the *Heathen Philosophers* with worshipping their Images as Gods, or Representations of False Gods, or as perfect Resemblances of the True God, is evident : For he acknowledges they held the truth in unrighteousness ; And that while they knew God, they chang'd the glory of the Incorruptible God into an Image &c. And that therein they pretended Wisdom. Wherefore it must be the Incorruptible God whom they worship'd under those Images, and for which they are here condemn'd ; and it is not to be suppos'd that the wiser Heathens who acknowledg'd the True God and his *Eternal Power and Godhead* shou'd worship the Images of Men or Beasts or Creeping things

as

charg'd upon the Heathens as Idolatry, 1 Rom : 20 &c. 39 as God's proper Likenesses of the Deity. For they acknowledg'd the Deity to be Infinite and Incorporeal, they worship'd Fountains, Groves, and Stones, as Representations of the Deity, which they cou'd not Imagin to have any proper Likeness thereto : They had no creeping or fourfooted Deitys, and yet they worship'd God under such kind of Representations. All that the Apostle charg'd 'em with is, that they represented their glorious Maker (whose Eternal Power and Godhead they discern'd in the Works of Creation) under Images of Corruptible things ; and because they did so, he saith they did not glorify him as God, but chang'd the Truth of God into a Lye, and worship'd and serv'd the Creature more than the Creator.

Hence it appears, that to honour God by an Image, and to honour him as God are Incompatible and the Doer thereof tho' pretending Wisdom becomes a Fool.

He that desires to Inform himself, as to the worship us'd by the wiser Heathens, will find these four particulars prov'd by such as have wrote on this Subject.

1. That the greater part of the Heathen Philosophers acknowledg'd one supream and Incorporeal Deity who created all other Beings, whom they worship'd under several Names, Images and Customs, to express his Power diffus'd thro' the World.

2. That they did not believe their Images of this Deity to have any proper Resemblance or likeness to the Deity, or to have any Divinity in 'em, but what came from Consecration to such an use ; And worship'd the Images of the Deity only as Analogical Representations thereof, giving it only a relative Worship. They held a more special presence of the Deity in their Images then elsewhere, which the Roman Church allows to theirs ; such Images being the more esteem'd, by how much the Person Worship'd has been suppos'd to have more frequently manifested himself therein, by speaking, moving, or Working Miracles.

3. That their Demons or Inferior Deitys were not Worship'd with Soverign Worship, or with the same worship they gave the Chief God, but with an Inferior Worship, such as the Roman Church gives to Saints and Angels.

4. That the Demons or Inferior Deitys they design'd to Worship, were not Evil Spirits, but Angels, and such Souls as they Accounted Deify'd, whom they held to be lower

lower than God, and yet above Men, and look'd on 'em as *Mediators* and *Intercessors* between God and Man, and what Divinity they ascrib'd to 'em was by *Gift* and *Participation* from the *Supream Deity*, by whom they were *Created*, and on whom they did depend.

These *Demons* they call'd *Gods*, and *Worship'd* their *Images* with the same *Worship* that the *Roman Church* worships the *Images* of *Saints* and *Angels*.

Hence it appears that the *Heathen Worship* of *Images* and the *Roman* differ not, unless in the *Names* of the *Persons* *Worship'd* and the *Circumstance* of the *Pope's Canonization*.

The *Demons* the *Heathens* *Worship'd* were *Shem, Japhet, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, &c.* under other *Names*; Men not *Inferior* for *Prudence* and *Piety* to *St. Francis, St. Benedict, St. Dominick, St. Ignatius Loyola*, and many other *Saints* whom the *Romans* *Worship*.

It's true the *Fathers* charge the *Heathens* with *Worshipping Devils*, but their *Reason* why they call'd 'em *Devils* was, because those *Spirits* they worship'd in their *Images* gave *Countenance* and *Encouragement* to their *Worshippers*, to proceed in their worship of 'em; and because good *Spirits* have refus'd to receive worship (because an *Encroachment* on *God's Prerogative*) therefore such *Spirits* as delighted in the worship given 'em, were by the *Fathers* call'd *Evil Spirits* or *Devils*.

De verâ,
Relig. cap. 55.

The *Worshipping Men* that are dead shou'd be no part of our *Religion* (says *St. Augustin*) " For if they did live pi-
" ously they are to be held as such as wou'd not seek that
" kind of honour.

In Psal. 96.

That the *Spirits* the *Heathens* intended to *Worship* were not *Evil Spirits* or *Devils*, but *Angels*, and such as they *Accounted Servants of the great God*, the *Heathen* in *St. Austin* declares, but forasmuch as no good *Spirit* will *Accept* of *worship*, and that the *Spirits* the *Heathens* worship'd did *Re-joice* in the worship given to 'em, and encourage the *Worshippers* of 'em by *speaking, moving, and working wonders*, therefore the *Fathers* concluded such *Spirits* to be *Devils*, that is to say, *Evil Spirits*, appeared under the names of *Good Men*, and receiv'd worship in such *Images*, as were intended for the *Worship* of *Good Men*. Let it be further consider'd, that when the *Fathers* charge the *Heathen Philosophers* with *worshipping False Gods*; The reason why they call 'em *False Gods*

charg'd upon the *Heathens as Idolatry*, Rom. 20, &c. 41
Gods is, because they gave them and their *Images Religious Worship*. For whatever is an *Object of Religious Worship*, becomes a *God* to the *Worshipper*, and consequently a *False God* when any *Creature* is made the *Object* thereof: And so the *Worshipper of the Creature* must be a *Worshipper of many Gods*, and there being but *one True God*, all other *Objects* of his *Worship* must be *False Gods*.

But of all kind of *Representations*, the *Worshipping God* under the *Image of a Man*, tends most to his *Dis honour*; because it induces the *Worshipper* to believe *God* to be a *Man*. Certainly to *Picture God* like an *Old Man with a grey beard*, and a *Popes Triple Crown upon his Head*, must make the *Vulgar* believe (if any *Representation* can) that either the *Pope* is *God*, or that *God* is very like the *Pope*. Were all *Romans Anthropomorphites*, and design'd to *Picture God* in the most agreeable form to their *Opinion*, they cou'd not *Picture* him otherwise than they do at present. And therefore *Pope John XXII* (as *Aventinus* relates) condemn'd some to the fire for *Anthropomorphites* and *Enemies to Religion*, for making the same *Images* of the *Trinity* that are at present us'd in the *Roman Church*, that is to say, of the *Father in the form of an Old Man*, of the *Son in the form of a Young Man*, and of the *Holy Ghost under the Picture of a Dove*.

Johannes Hesselius (an *Eminent Divine* in the *Council of Trent*) observ'd that from the *Images of God in a Human shape*, Men may easily fall into the *Error of the Anthropomorphites*; especially the more *ignorant*, for whose sakes especially those *Images* were made: It being not so easy for them to understand *Metaphorical* and *Analogical Representations*. It being very *Natural* for them to Judge of things according to the most *common* and *sensible Representations* of 'em. And that the *Effects* do answer the *Cause* is too well known and lamented by many of their *Learned Men*; who have cry'd out for the removing of 'em, but to little purpose.

George Cassander, a learned *Papist*, acknowledges that the *Cens. Art.* worship of *Images* and *Statues*, has proceeded so far in the *21. c. de Roman Church*, that it is come to the very height of that *Imag. Worship* which *Pagans* gave to their *Idols*. And *Polidore De Invent. Virgil* tells us, that the *Worship of Images* is arriv'd to that *height of madness* in the *Roman Church*, that their *Piety* therein do's little differ from *Impiety*. *rerum Lib. 6. c. 13.*

C H A P. VIII.

Containing a Sixth Argument against Image-Worship; Wherein is prov'd that it's greater Idolatry to Worship GOD under the Image of a Man, than to Worship Stones, Groves, and Fountains, Sun, Moon, and Stars; and all kind of Animals, whatever as God's Representation.

IF it be Idolatry to Worship Stones, Groves and Fountains, Sun, Moon and Stars, and all kind of Animals whatever, as God's Representations (which will not be deny'd by any Learn'd Romanist) then must it be greater Idolatry to Worship God under the Image of a Man; forasmuch as the Second Commandment, do's more expressly forbid the worshipping the Images of Things, than the things themselves. Nor can any Reason be given to prove it more unlawful to Worship God in a Tree or Stone, than in an Image. Why shou'd not a Natural Image be as fit an Object to represent God by, as an Artificial? Why shou'd not an unpolish't Stone, or piece of Wood, be as fit an Object to convey Man's Devotions to God, as the same carv'd or polish't into the form of a Man? If any Image be lawful, that Image must be accounted most lawful, that least inclines the miserable Soul to bow down to it (upon the account of a suppos'd Resemblance betwixt it and God). Now there is not any Worshipper, but will be more easily induc'd to imagin a Resemblance betwixt God and a Tree carv'd into the Image of a Man, than if it had remain'd unpolish't.

Ans.

If it be Answered that Pictures have Advantages of Representation which unpolish't Stones and Timber have not.

Rep.

Reply. It's true, Images and Pictures may Represent Men and Women and other Creatures better, but not God: He is Infinite, and therefore can't be better Represented by the One than the Other. And if we consider Representations in order to Worship (to which end they are made in the Roman Church) those Representations wherein Divine Perfections are most conspicuous (if any be lawful) are to be preferr'd. Now there is not any living Creature (the meanest Animal) wherein Divine perfections are not more visible, than in the most curious Pictures. The

The *Apostle* tells us, that God has manifested his *Eternal Rom. i. 20.* Wisdom and Power in the *Creature*, which he never did in a *Carv'd Image*.

And the *Psalmist* tells us, that the *Heavens declare the Psal. 19.* Glory of God and the *Firmament sheweth his handy work*, which was never ascrib'd to the work of a *Painter*: And in all *Representations* designed for *Worship*, such are to be accounted most excellent, which best set forth the *Nature* of the *Being* that is hereby *Worship'd*. And in this respect the meanest *Animal* (yea, the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*) deserve more to be *worship'd* than any *Image whatever*: For in them the *Invisible things of God are clearly seen*, but in a *Carved* or *Painted Image* nothing can be seen, but the excellent *Workmanship* of the *Artificer* or *Painter*.

Therefore forasmuch as the meanest *Creatures of God's making* represent those *perfections*, which are the reason of our worshipping God, more than any *Image of Man's making* can do, it must be more lawful to worship them, than an *Image*; And consequently more lawful to worship the *Sun* than a *Crucifix*.

And if it be lawful to worship the *Image* of a *Man* as *God's Representation*, why shou'd it not be lawful to worship every *Man* on the same *Account*? *Man* is *God's Creature*, made after *God's Image*; But the *Image of a Man* is *Man's Creature*; and therefore if *Worship* may be given to any upon the *Account of Representation*, it ought rather to be given to *God's Creature* than to *Man's*. And consequently if we ought not to worship God in a *Man*, to avoid the *Danger of Idolatry*, we ought not to worship God in the *Image of a Man* for the same Reason.

If it be *Answer'd* that there is greater danger of terminating the worship on a *Man*, because he is a *Creature subsisting of himself*. Answ.

Reply. 2. There is as much *Danger* of terminating the *Act of Worship* on the *Image of a Man*, as upon *Man himself*. As to the *Learned Worshipper* the *Danger is equal*, and to the *Ignorant Worshipper*, no *Creature* can more endanger his terminating the *Act of Worship* upon it, than to have the *Image of a Man* richly deck't presented before him to *prostrate himself*, *burn Incense*, and *make his supplication* to it.

St. Austin tells us, that *Christians* in his Time had several *Instruments and Vessels of Silver and Gold*, for the use of *Celebrating*

44 To Worship God under the Image of a Man, &c.

Conc. 2.

celebrating the Sacrament, which being Consecrated are called *holy*: But *these have no Mouth nor Eyes*; " This (saith the Father) is the greatest cause of this mad Impiety, that the Form like to one living (which maketh it to be supplicated to) doth more prevail in the Affections of miserable Men. For *Images* prevail more to bow down the unhappy Soul, in that they have *Eyes*, they have a *Mouth*, they have *Ears*, they have *Nostrils*, they have *Hands* and *Feet*, &c. And so proceeds to shew that the *Human Form* doth more tend to deceive Ignorant People to their worship than the want of Sense can do to keep Men from it.

Had St. *Austin* liv'd in times of *Popery*, he wou'd have been acquainted with other *Reasons* whereby Images prevail to bow down the unhappy Soul: As being *Gloath'd with rich apparel*, by art made to *twinkle with the Eyes*, to *distill Tears*, to *nod with the Head*, and even to *Speak*, all which is too well known to be *practic'd* in the *Roman Church*, to allure the *Vulgar* to a *Veneration* of their Images.

Divin. Inst.

Lib. 2. c. 2.

Lactantius tells us, that if there ought to be any Image of God, it ought to be *living* and *sensible*, because *God lives for ever*: Therefore that can't be the *Image of God*, that is made by the *work of Men's Hands*, but *Man himself*, that gives all the *Art* and *Beauty* to 'em that they have.

Rep: 2:

2. If such *Representations* are most *lawful*, that least endanger the Worshippers terminating the Act of Worship on 'em, then must those *Representations* that have the least of Excellency in 'em be accounted the *most lawful Representations*: And so the *Heathens* that worship'd God under Images of *creeping* and *inanimate things*, shou'd be more *prudent* and more *excusable Idolaters*, than the *Papists*, who worship him under the Image of a *Man*.

C H A P. IX.

*Containing a Seventh Argument against Image-Worship ;
Wherein is prov'd that to Worship any Image whatever is
Idolatry.*

TO give that Worship to the *Creature* that is due only to the *True God*, is acknowledg'd by all the *Roman Doctors* to be *Idolatry*. And that all kind of *Religious Worship whatever*, without distinction, is due only to the *True God*, has been already prov'd from *Matth. 4. 10 v.* (*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve*) in *part 2d. Chap. 9th. Argument 6th.* to which I shall at present only refer my Reader.

And that to *Worship any Image* is to give *Religious Worship* to the *Creature* can't be deny'd; *Images* are the *Creatures Creature*, they are *inanimate things*, not capable of *Civil Worship*; they are not of the *same Civil Society* with *Men*; they have no *Excellency* in 'em to deserve *Honour*, nor *Superiority* over us to require *Worship*: Therefore that *Worship* that's paid to 'em must be accounted *Religious Worship*, and this the *Roman Church* do's not deny.

Moreover when *Worship* is Accompany'd with those *Circumstances* that make it a *Religious Performance*, that *Worship* must be concluded to be *Religious Worship*: Now they bow and kneel to *Images*, in their *Churches*, in times of *Prayer*, yea, they pray and burn *Incense* to 'em; which *Circumstances* do determine the *Act of Worship*, and make it signify *Religious Adoration*.

I have heard some *Roman Catholick Gentlemen* of this King-
dom say, That they do not *Worship the Image before whom they bow, kneel, and pray to*.

Ans. 1. The *Council of Nice* has decreed worship to be paid to *Images*, the same do their *Learned Doctors* teach, as has been prov'd *Chap. 2. part 3.* And that to use *Images only for helps to Memory*, and not for *Worship* is *Heresy*: And such as do so are *Anathematiz'd* by the said *Council*, and likewise by the *Council of Trent*.

It's well known the Common sort of People, not only in this Kingdom, but also in *Spain and Italy*, not only *Worship Images*, but also *Worship 'em* upon the Account of a supposed *vertue inherent in 'em*, they *pray to 'em*, they *put their trust in 'em*, and have no skill to distinguish betwixt the *Exemplar* and the *Image*.

There are *Images* of some *Patron Saints* in this Kingdom known to prove good *Pledges* when their Keepers are in want of Money; which on the *Patron-day* are sure to be *redeem'd*, out of such *Offerings* as are made to 'em. Which *Practices* if their *Learned Churchmen* did disapprove of they wou'd take care to mend 'em; which they will be never able to do, without removing the *Occasions* of 'em.

Answer. 2. Where *Images* are set up for representing *God and Saints*; and *Worship* therefore decreed to 'em, he that pays the *external acts of Adoration* (that is, *bows or kneels or prays*) to or before such representations, (which are therefore set up that they may be *Worshipped*) must be a *Worshipper* of 'em (whatever his Intention be) because he *bows, kneels and prays before such Representations* as are therefore set up that they may be *Worshipped*. The *burning Incense* is a thing in it self *lawful*; but if a *Christian* burn it before an *Idol*, the *Primitive Church* accounted him an *Idolater*, tho' he intended not thereby the *Worship of the Idol*.

3. I answer, that in *bowing or kneeling before the Image of God, Christ and Saints*, the whole *Act of Worship* must be *Terminated on the Image*: there can't be *two Objects*, and but *one Act of Worship*. You'll say you intend your *Act of Worship* to be *terminated on God*. I answer, your *Intention* will not do it. For if *God* can't be *Worship'd* by that *Act of Adoration* you pay to or before an *Image* your *Intention* signifies nothing; And if *God* be not thereby *Worshipped*, then must your *Act of Adoration* be terminated on the *Image*: For it must be terminated *somewhere*. The Question will here lye whether *God* can be worship'd by that *Act of Adoration* a Man pays to or before an *Image*? I prove he cannot, for the following Reasons.

1. Because no *Act of Worship* can have *two Objects*. Nothing must come between the *Face of God*, and the *Act of Worship*, that is given to *God*, as an *Object* of that *Act*: If it do's, *God* disclaims the *Act of Worship*, and places it on that *Object*, that comes between him and the *Act of Worship*. *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, or before*

Reason 1.

my Face, Exod. 20. 3 v. Now the *Image* being an *Object* of the *Act* of *Worship*, comes *betwixt* *God's Face* and the *Act of Worship*; and so becomes a *God before the Face of God*, and therefore solely terminates the *Act of Worship*. For which Reason *Aaron's Calf* is call'd an *Idol*, and a *Molten Image*, as has been shew'd, Chap. 4. Arg. 2. Answer to the sixth Part 3 Objection.

2. Because all *Worship* must be an *Honouring of God*. Reason 2. In every *Act of Religious Worship* *God* must be more or less honour'd. If he be not *honour'd* by that *Act of Worship* a *Man* pays to or before an *Image*, he is not *Worshipped* by that *Act*. And if not *Worship'd* thereby, then must the *Act of Worship* be solely terminated on the *Image*, let a *Man's Intention* be what it will.

Among such *Acts of Worship* as *God* requir'd of the *Jewish Nation*, *Sacrificing* was one, but they were forbidden to *Sacrifice* the *Lame* or the *Blind*. Suppose a *Covetous Jew* to have *Sacrific'd* the *Lame* and the *Blind*; yet notwithstanding his *Act of Sacrifice* was *terminated on God*, both because it had no other *Object*, as also because the *Worship of Sacrifice* was enjoin'd by *God*. *God* was *Worship'd* and honour'd by the *Sacrifice*, tho' not in that *degree* and *measure*, as if the *Sacrifice* had been without *Blemish*.

Among such *Religious Acts of Worship* as *God* has requir'd from *Christians*, *Prayer* is one: yet he has commanded all that *call upon his Name to depart from their Iniquity*. I persevere in my *Iniquity*, yet pray to him, my *Act of Prayer* is notwithstanding terminated on *God*, both because it has no other *Object*, as also because *Prayer* is a part of that *Homage* or *Religious Worship*, that *God* (as the *Sovereign Lord of the Universe*) requires from all *Mankind*. Therefore *God* is honour'd by my praying to him, but not in that *Degree* and *Measure* as he wou'd be, had my *Prayer* proceeded from a *pure Heart*, and *Faith unfeign'd*. It's true my *Prayer* benefits me not, because *I regard Iniquity in my Heart*, and for this Reason *God* is said *not to hear my Prayer*; and that it is an *unpleasing Sacrifice* to him: yet still it is a *Sacrifice*, an *Act of Religious Worship*, and terminated on *God*.

But forasmuch as the *Worship of an Image*, is not a *Worship of God's prescribing*, and *God* will not be worship'd in *ways of Man's devising*, and that *God* cannot be *Represented* by

by an *Image*, and has forbidden all Attempts to represent him thereby, and declar'd that in Worshipping any such Representation, we do not honour him, but expose him to Contempt; it must follow that the *Act of Worship* pay'd to or before an *Image*, cannot be terminated on God; and therefore solely on the *Image*, which thereby becomes an *Idol*, and the Worshipper an *Idolater*.

C H A P. X.

Containing an Answer to such Arguments, and Reasons as are insisted on by Learned Men of the Roman Church to prove the lawfulness of Image-Worship.

Arg. 1:

IN the first place they argue that if it be unlawful to Worship an *Image* of God, the reason must be because God is thereby represented in a way inferior to his greatness; but whoever worships God represented to him, (without the Beatifick Vision) either by *Words* or *Imaginations*, Worships him in a way far inferior to his Greatness; therefore the Worship of God by an *Image* of him must be no *Idolatry*, or all must be *Idolaters* that Worship God without the Beatifick vision.

Answ.

Answer. There is a great deal of Difference betwixt having an imperfect Conception of God in our minds, and making unworthy Representations of him to our senses (and especially with a design to Worship 'em). God did not forbid the *Israelites* to think of him but commanded 'em so to do, tho' their Conceptions cou'd not be suitable to his Incomprehensible Nature. Our Understandings are necessarily weak because we are Men, and therefore cannot comprehend the Perfections of an Infinite and Incomprehensible God. But the making *Images* of God is a voluntary Act, and therefore forbidden to prevent Error in our *Imaginations*; and consequently to keep us from having unworthy thoughts of God. We are commanded to have no other thoughts of God, but that he is a Being infinitely Perfect, Infinite in Wisdom, Power and Godness, &c.

Such

Such thoughts as these tho' they cannot reach God's Greatness, yet they do not confine it, nor debase it; and are to be term'd *Intellectual Conceptions*, and not *material Imaginations*. But he that brings God so far down to his *Imagination* as to think of him as he is *Pictur'd* in the *Roman Church* like an *Old Man sitting in Heaven*, has such a *Material Imagination* of God as is altogether unworthy of him, such as contradicts the evidence we have of his Being (for he that believes him not to be *Infinite* cannot believe him to be *God*) but to make an Image of God suitable to his Imagination, is to devise ways to expose God to scorn and Contempt; because we cannot but despise a *Deity*, to which any *Image* can be *like*.

And this is the great Reason, insisted on by the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*, against *Images of God*, viz. Because they beget in Men's minds, *mean* and *unworthy* thoughts of God: Men's Imaginations being easily tainted and corrupted, by Corporeal Representations, especially when they become Objects of Worship.

“ And therefore *Clemens Alexandrinus* tells us, that the Strom. p. 559.
“ making a visible Representation of the Deity lessens his
“ Majesty, and is a Disparagement to an Intellectual Be- Strom. p. 584
“ ing, to worship him under sensible Matter. And there-
“ fore *Moses* did forbid any kind of Image to be made of
“ God, that we might ascend above *sensible things*, there-
“ by declaring God to be *Invisible* and *Incomprehensible*.

“ And *Origen* (against *Celsus*) tells us, That Christians p. 376.
“ did not forbear the use of *Images* because they had no
“ Religion, but because they dar'd not to make use of
“ this way of Worshipping God; because it is a *Disparage-*
“ *ment* to the *Deity*, and because the *Law of God* forbids it:
“ and therefore saith, that Christians will rather *dye* then
“ defile themselves with *Images*, and that it's impossible a-
“ ny shou'd know God, and pray to *Images*.

2. They argue from *Exod. 20. 4. 5 v.* Which Text
they say equally forbids the *making of Images*, as well as the Object. 2.
Worshipping of 'em; therefore if *Protestants* allow the *making of*
'em, they ought not to *disallow* the *Worshipping of 'em*.

Answ. The foremention'd Text only forbid the *making* Sol.
of *Images for Worship*: compare it with *Lev. 26. 1 v.* To
make an Image of God, is against all Rules of Reason and Reli-
gion (as has been shew'd) but to make any other Image, may

50 *The Argument for Image-Worship Answer'd.*

be lawful, provided it be not made *ad Adorandum*, to bow down thereto. This Command therefore do's not forbid the making any *Sculpture* or *Similitude* (for *Moses* made the *Similitude* of *Cherubims*, and a *Serpent*) but only the making any such for worship. This will appear, if we consider the Prohibition; *Thou shalt not make to thee or to thy self, any Image, or Likeness*: The words *to thee* or *thy self* must be Interpreted of making of 'em for Objects of Worship; And accordingly it is explain'd in the words following, *Thou shalt not bow down thy self unto them, nor serve them*.

Object. 3. 3. They argue from *Moses's* making *Cherubims*, and placing 'em in the *Sanctuary*.

Sol. *Ans. 1.* Protestants do not deny the Lawfulness of making any Image save only of God.

Exod. 25. 22. 2. The *Cherubims* were plac'd in the *Sanctuary* for Ornament only, and not for worship; they were put into such a Place where the People never came, and so cou'd be no Occasion of Idolatry. The *High-Priest* went into the *Holy of Holys*, where the *Cherubims* were plac'd, but only once a year, and then worship'd not the *Cherubims*, but the *Invisible God*; who is said to sit betwixt the *Cherubims*. Had the *Cherubims* been intended for Representations of God, or Objects of Worship, they wou'd have been plac'd where the People might have seen 'em.

Object. 4. 4. They Argue from *Moses's* erecting a *Brazen Serpent*, Numb. 21. 8 v. This *Serpent*, say they, was erected by *Moses*, that it might be Ador'd; which proves, say they, the lawfulness of the Adoration of an Image.

Answer. 1. *Ans. 1.* This Objection *Tertullian* thus Answers, "*Tu imitare Moysen, ne facias adversus legem aliquod, nisi tibi jusserit Deus*, do you (saith he) imitate *Moses*, till God command thee thou may'st make no Image against God's Law.

Answer 2. *Ans. 2.* The *Brazen Serpent* was not Erected to be Ador'd but only to be look'd upon, being a means that God had appointed, to Cure the *Israelites* stung with the fiery *Serpents*. John 3. 14. 15. The *Brazen Serpent* was herein a Type of *Christ*, and shadow'd forth his *Crucifixion* to us; and the means of Man's Recovery by looking on him with the Eye of Faith. We read about Five Hundred Years after, when the Children fell into many Idolatry's, they added thereto the worshipping of the *Brazen Serpent*; which caus'd King *Hezekiah* to break it into

into pieces, for which and other good Acts, he is said to do that 2 Kings 18. which is right in the sight of the Lord. 4.

5. They argue from Josh. 7. 6 v. Where Joshua and the Object. 5. Elders of Israel are said to fall down before the Ark of the Lord; hence concluding the lawfulness of falling down before an Image.

Ans. The Ark was a place wherein God had promised to Sol. exhibit his presence to his People in an Extraordinary manner, therefore they worship'd God before his Ark; they prostrated themselves not to, but before the Ark of the Lord.

God is essentially present every where, but in Heaven there is a more glorious Exhibition of his Presence than in any other Place, therefore we worship God before the Heavens, lifting up our Hands and Eyes, and directing our Prayers thither. And therefore the Jews worship'd God towards the Temple, because God promis'd a more peculiar Presence of himself there than elsewhere.

To worship God towards any Place is lawful, provided we make God and not the Place the Object of our Worship; In like manner to worship God before a Creature not prohibited is lawful, provided the Creature be not made an Object of the Act of Worship, or set up to the End that it may be worshipped; Now the Ark was no Representation, nor plac'd in the Tabernacle, that it might be worship'd; but being the Place where God promis'd to meet his People, Joshua and the Elders prostrated themselves to God before his Ark or special-meeting Place.

But Images in the Roman Church are set up for Objects of Worship: The Councils of Nice and Trent have decreed due Worship to be given to 'em (as they are Representations) and to worship only before an Image is accounted Heresy. Therefore the present practice of the Roman Church in kneeling and falling down before an Image, can't be justified from Joshua and the Elders of Israel falling down before the Ark.

Moreover God has nowhere promis'd to yield any such presence of himself in an Image as he did in the Ark; but has forbid all kind of Representations of himself, and prohibited Worship to be given to any Representation whatever. What has been here said in Answer to this Objection, may serve for an Answer to Psal. 95 v. 9. and other Scriptures.

6. They argue from God's Command to Moses and Joshua, to pull off their shoes Exod. 3. 5. v. Josh. 5. 15 v. Object. 6.

52 *The Arguments for Image-Worship Answer'd.*

thence inferring that *Moses* and *Joshua* did *Worship* the *Ground*, why may not an *Image* be as well *Worship'd* as the *Earth*?

Sol:

Answer 1. What *Moses* and *Joshua* did they had an *Express Command* from *God* for, which can't be pretended for *Worshipping of Images*.

2. The *pulling off their shoes* requir'd in the aforesaid *Texts* was only a *Ceremony* us'd in the *Eastern Countrys*, equivalent to our *putting off our Hats*, an *Expression of Respect* which we manifest in our *Churches* while we are *Worshipping God* in 'em, because *Dedicated to God's Service*; and *places* wherein the *Mysteries of Salvation* are *exhibited* to us, as also being *necessary places* for our *Publick Worshipping of God*: And therefore it's but reasonable we shou'd testify some *Estimation* of 'em, more than of our *common Houses*, wherein we *Eat and Drink*. But *Images* have not only no *Relation* to *God*, but are *prohibited* by him; they are *unnecessary* and *useless things* in *God's Worship*: And have not only *honour*, but *Worship* given 'em in the *Roman Church*.

3. *Moses* and *Joshua* did not *Worship* the *Ground*; the *Ground* was *holy* all that *Time*, by reason of *God's special presence* there, but *God only* was the *Object* of their *Worship*. The *Holiness* of the *Ground*, was only the *Occasion* of their *worshipping God* in those *places*.

But *Images* are made *Objects* of *Worship*, they are not only *honour'd* in the *Roman Church* by *pulling off the Hat*, but they are to be *worshipped* with all *external Acts* of *Adoration*, as *bowings, bendings of the knee, Incensings, burning of Candles, and Praying to 'em*; and not only the *outward Acts*, but the *Inward submission of the mind*, must *Accompany* the *Outward Acts*, and *both* must be *terminated* on the *Image*, (as has been shewn in the *Second Chapter* of this *Discourse* of *Image-Worship*) and therefore the *Practice* of the *Roman Church* herein, can't be warranted from *Moses's* and *Joshua's pulling off their shoes*.

Object. 7.

7. They argue from such *Appearances* as *God* has been pleas'd to afford of himself; concluding thence the *Lawfulness* of *Representing* him in a *Human Shape*.

Sol:

Answer. We have no sufficient ground to conclude from *Scripture*, that *God the Father* did ever appear in an *Human Shape*. He has appear'd by *Fire*, by *Storm*, and *Tempest*, by a *Cloud*,

Cloud, and by a *still Voice*; But that he *Appear'd* in any *Human Shape*, can't be concluded from *Daniel's Vision*, nor any other Scripture. And for *Picturing the Trinity* there can be no pretence, unless to expose that *Sacred Mystery* to the contempt of *Anti-Trinitarians*.

" Since the world began (saith *Polydore Virgil*) never Lib. 1. de In-
 " was any thing more foolish than to *picture God*, who is es- SEN. C. 23.
 " sentially present every where.

Lactantius proves the unreasonableness of worshipping Divine In-
 God by an Image from this very reason, " *because Images* stit. Lib. 2. c. 2.
 " *are intended to represent the Absent*; but *God is every where*.

Therefore to Worship the *Father and Trinity* under out-
 ward forms, is to Worship forms of their own making, and de-
 vising, and consequently *Chimera's* or *Imaginary Beings*; that
 is to say, *Idols*, according to their own Principles.

" If any one (saith *Durandus*) shall say, that because
 " the *Holy Ghost* appear'd in the *Form* of a *Dove*; and the
 " *Father* in the *Old Testament* in a *Corporal Form*, that
 " therefore they may be represented by *Images*; we must
 " say to this, that those *Corporeal Forms*, were not *Assum'd*
 " by the *Father* and *Holy Ghost*. And therefore a *Representation*
 of 'em by *Images*, is not a *Representation* of the *Divine*
Person, but only a *Representation* of the *form* and *shape*;
 And if there be no *Reverence* due to those *Forms* by them-
 selves, there can be no *Reverence* due to their *Representa-*
tions. Neither were those *Forms* intended to represent
 the *Divine Person*, but to *Represent* the *effects* which the *Divine*
Person did produce: For Instance, when *God* manifested
 himself in the *burning Bush*, the *Fire* was only an *effect* of
 the *Divine Power*, and therefore deserv'd no *Divine Worship*,
 and if the *Fire* (in it self. Consider'd) deserv'd no *Divine*
Worship, how can the *Image* of this *Fire* be (without *Idola-*
try) made the *Object* of *Divine Worship*? Suppose *God* had
Appear'd to *Daniel* in the *Form* of an *Old Man*, that *Form* was
 not *God*, but only an *Effect* of *God's Power*. It had no *Perjo-*
nal Union to *God*, and therefore was no more but a *meer Crea-*
ture; And therefore cou'd not deserve *Divine Adoration*,
 much less than can the *Image* of this *Form* which is, at best,
 but the *Creature's Creature*. I shall add no more, because a
 full Answer to this Objection has been already given in the
 6th Chapter of this Discourse relating to *Image-Worship*.

8thly, They Argue that in making and worshipping the
Images

54 *The Arguments for Image-Worship Answer'd.*

Images of God and Saints, they express their *Love and Affection* to 'em. The *Love and Honour* given to the *Image* relates to the *Person Represented by it*. When they *Adore and Kiss the Hands and Feet* of the *Image of Christ*, they *adore and kiss by Inward Imagination and Affection the True Hands and Feet of Christ himself*. Such as we *Love and Honour* most, we desire to *have and keep their Pictures*, and the *Love and Honour* manifested to the *Picture*, shews the *Ardency of Affection* to the *Person* whose *Picture* it is: And the *Affronts and Abuses* done to the *Image or Picture* shews our *disrespect and disesteem* of the *Person* represented by it.

Sol.

Ans. Shou'd an *Earthly Prince* command his *Subjects* not to make any *Picture or Representation* of him, and declare it *Treason* so to do. Will any *Man of Sense* judge it a sufficient excuse in the *Transgressing Subject*, to say, I made my *Princes Picture* out of *Affection* to my *Prince*: Such trifling *Pleas* are *misbecoming Men of Prudence*. To *make Images of God* has been prov'd to be utterly unlawful; (since *Images* can suggest no other thoughts of *God* to our *Minds* but what are most *injurious and dishonourable* to him) and to *worship* any such *Image* of him has been prov'd to be *Idolatry*. We are to testify our *Affection* to *God* in *ways of God's prescribing*. *Christ* do's not say, *If you love me, make my Picture, Keep, Embrace and Worship it*; but saith, *if ye love me keep my Commandments*. If we *love and honour God* we must manifest it by *yielding Obedience* to his *Commands*, and not by *violating* of 'em, as we do by the *making and worshipping* any *Picture* of himself, much more of any *Creature*.

As to that saying, *That the worship of an Image, transit ad Exemplar, passes to the Original* (attributed by *Damascen* to *St. Basil*, and much insisted on by the *Roman Doctors*) it is to be understood of the *Statues of Emperors*, and that *Civil Honour*, which by the *Consent and Custom* of the *World*, is thereby given to 'em, because it was so accepted of 'em.

Object. 9.

9. They Argue, That forasmuch as *Images* are great *helps to Devotion*, they ought to be *made and worship'd*. He that fixes his *Eye* on the *Picture* of a *Suffering Saviour*, and on the *Pictures* of such as have *suffered for his sake*, must have his *Affections Inflam'd*, and his *Ardency* in *Prayer* increas'd by the *sight* of such *Objects*.

Ans. Such *Pictures* as are *lawful* to be made may be us'd

as

as helps to memory, but not as *Objects of Worship*. If by the view of a *Picture* thy Affections may be more carry'd to God, turn aside and beware of Offering thy Devotions to God through the *Picture*. There are many *seeming helps to Devotion* which in the end prove *real hindrances to Piety*, among which the view of *Pictures* may prove *one*, some flashes of Devotion they may procure; but he that will have his *Devotion* to prove *permanant and lasting*, must found it on the *Meditation of Christ*, and the *Saints Sufferings*, and not on the *view of their Pictures*. And how devout such are where *Images* are most in use he that *Travels to Rome* will soon discern.

“ If (saith *Arnobius*) you believe your Gods to be in Heaven, to what purpose do you make Images of 'em to worship? can't you as well pray to the Gods themselves? you'll say (saith he) that you represent 'em as present by your Images. To which he thus Replys, “ He that thinks that he must have Gods to be seen, do's not believe any God's at all. You'll say that you worship God through your Images, To which he Replys, Can there be any thing more reproachful and injurious to God, than to know him to be one thing, and yet pray to another? to expect help from the Deity, and yet fall down before a senseless Statue? which is, as if a Man shou'd pretend to take Advice of Men, and ask it of Asses, and Swine. Is not this (saith he) madness to fall down trembling before a thing made by themselves? Which Reasoning of *Arnobius* against the *Heathens*, is equally applicable to the *Practice of the Roman Church*.

10. They Argue, That if *Image-Worship* be *Idolatry*, Object. 10. and consequently the *Roman Church* an *Idolatrous Church*, then must the *Church of England* be no *True Church*, forasmuch as it has receiv'd its *Ordination of Bishops and Priests* from the *Church of Rome*. Therefore in Charging the *Church of Rome* with *Idolatry*, we do (say they) *Unchurch our Selves*.

Ans. All kind of *Idolatry* do's not destroy the being Sol. of a Church. The Church of *Israel* continu'd a *True Church* (tho' not a pure one) tho' it Worship'd the *Calves* as a *Representation of God*; but when the *Idolatry of Baal* prevail'd, then, and not before, it's *visibillity* began to cease: And after *Baal* was destroy'd the *Israelites* return'd to the worship of the *Calves*, in which way of worship they continu'd

1 Kings 14.
18 v.
2 Kings 9.6.
and 13. 23 v.
Hos. 11. 8.9.
and 14 v.

56 *The Arguments for Image-Worship Answer'd.*

Amos 8. 2. v. continu'd to the Time of their Captivity, and that du-
and 4. 12 v. ring that Time they were a *True Church*, appears from
Micah 6. 2. 3. those many Scriptures, wherein God is pleased to own
hem for his People.

Therefore a Church may be a *True Church*, and yet
very impure, and guilty of *Idoltrous Practices*. Now if
a Church remains *True* as to its *Essence* (tho' corrupt as
to some *Idoltrous Practices*) its Acts of *Ordination* and
Consecration are *valid*.

Acts 6. p. 11. The *Arian Bishops* were accounted by the *Catholick*
Church, *Idolaters*, as also by the *Second Nicene Council*;
and yet their *Ordinations* were allow'd of, by their great
Ep. ad An- Adversary *Athanasius*; and no more requir'd from such
tioch. p. 575. as Recanted, than the *Renouncing Arianism*, and Subscri-
bing to the *Nicene Creed*. And that this was the gene-
Lib. 1. c. 8. ral practice of the Church, *Ruffinus* acknowledges in his
Act. 1. *Ecclesiastical History*, the same is allow'd by the *Second Ni-
cene Council*, in the Instance of *Miletius*.

To *Worship* the *Creature* as *God*, is to give *Sovereign*
Worship to a *Plurality of Gods*; or must suppose the *Wor-
shipper* to *Renounce* the *True God*, which kind of *Idoltry*
is not consistent with the *Essence* of a *True Church*.

But to *Worship* the *Creature* as a *Representation* of the
True God, tho' it infer the *Creature* to be a *God* to the *Wor-
shipper*, and the *Worshipper* consequently an *Idolater*; yet
forasmuch as the *Act* of *Worship*, is by the *Worshipper*
intended to be *terminated* on the *True God*; It is such an
Idoltry as do's not destroy the being of a Church (pro-
vide it retains the general principles of Faith) tho' in-
consistent with the *Moral Integrity* and *Soundness* of a
Church.

Therefore forasmuch as the *Roman Church* retains the
general Principles of Faith, it is to be accounted a *True*
Church, as to it's *Essence*. But forasmuch as it adds to those
Principles, many *Errors* which lead Men into *Idoltrous*
Practices, it is justly chargeable with *Idoltry*: yet being
a *True Church*, as to it's *Essence*, it's *Ordinations* are to be
Accounted *valid*. *Aaron* was a *True Priest* at the Time of
Making and *Worshipping* the *Golden Calf*.

Having giving an Answer to the most *Material Reasons*
insisted on by the *Roman Doctors*, to prove the *Lawfulness*
of *Image-Worship*: Before I conclude this Chapter, I
think

think fit to answer some *Cavils*; wherewith they amuse the Ignorant, grounded on some *Practices* us'd in the Church of England, as,

1. *Bowing before the Altar*: An *Image* (say they) deserves *Object*: *Worship* as well as an *Altar*.

Answer. The Church of England allows not of *Worshipping* *Ans*: the *Altar*, but only of *Bowing* or *Worshipping* of *God* before the *Altar* or *Communion Table*. *Altars* are not plac'd in the Church of England, for *Representations* of *God*, or *Objects* of *Worship*: And therefore *Acts* of *Devotion* may be as Lawfully perform'd before 'em as before other *Creatures*. But *Images* in the Roman Church are set up for *Representations* of *God*, and *Saints*; they are *Objects* of *Worship*: They come between the *Face* of *God*, and the *Act* of *Worship*, and so become *Idols*, as has been already shew'd at large.

2. *Protestants* (say they) bow at the *Name* of *Jesus*. *Words* *Object*: are *Pictures* to the *Ears*, and *Pictures* words to the *Eyes*, If it be lawful to bow to the *Name*, it must be lawful to bow to the *Picture* of *Jesus*.

Answer. 1. There is a great deal of difference betwixt *Ans*: words and *Pictures*. It is acknowledg'd by Learned *Romanists*, that because *Words* signify only by *Imposition*, there can be no *Worship* due to 'em; And that the Reason why *Worship* is due to *Images* is, because they supply the place of the thing represented, which words cannot.

2. Such *Protestants* as bow at the *Name* of *Jesus*, do not worship the *Name* of *Jesus*, they only worship *Jesus* when they hear him sometimes Nam'd, thereby Acknowledging *Jesus* to be *God*, and themselves to be neither *Arians* nor *Socinians*. It is not the *Name*, but the *Person* whom they *Worship*; and the *Name* is only an *Occasion* of the *Worship* given to the *Person*.

Bowing at the *Name* of *Jesus* (saith *Archbishop Laud*) is no more but giving honour to the Son of *God* at the mentioning of his *Name*. Phil. 2. 10 v. is to be understood of the *Dignity*, *Power*, and *Authority* that *Christ* is in *Heaven* invested with; and by bowing is to be understood *Faith* in *Christ*, and *Subjection* to his *Power*.

3. *Protestants* (say they) honour and reverence their *Bibles*, *Object*: *Churches*, and *Ustensils* of the *Altar*: and why may not an *Image* be as well honour'd and reverenc'd, as other inanimate things?

Sol.

Answ. 1. There is a great deal of difference betwixt meer *Honour* and *Worship*: *Worship* is a *Submission* to an *Object*, upon the *Account* of it's *Superiority* over us, which no *inanimate thing* can be capable of: But *inanimate things* upon the *Account* of some *Excellency* they may derive from their *use*, may have a due *respect* and *honour* given to 'em. Now forasmuch as things *dedicated* to *God's Worship* and *Service*, cease thereby to be *common*, a due *Respect* is to be given to 'em, which is manifested by *separating* them to *God's Worship*, and not converting them to *common uses*: But they are not to be *worship'd*; we are not to *kneel* and *prostrate* our selves to *Bibles* and *Churches*, nor to express any mark of *Submission* to 'em.

Object.

But *Images* are set up as *Representations* of *God* and *Saints*, (and the *Representation* is the *Ground* and *Reason* why *Worship* is given to 'em) which *Churches* and *Bibles* are not: There are *uses* for 'em in the *Administration* of *God's Service*, and the designing 'em to those *peculiar uses*, is the *Reverence* that is due to 'em.

2. There is not the same *Reason* for giving *Reverence* to an *Image* (tho' there were no more requir'd) as to things *Consecrated* to *God's Service*, because there is no necessity for 'em, as there is for *Churches*, *Bibles*, and *Chalices*; as also because *God* has *prohibited* their *use*. Were they capable of *Instructing* us, or of *Teaching* us the mind and will of *God*, as the *Scriptures* are, and that they had been appointed to that *End*, the same *Reverence* ought to be given 'em, as to the *Holy Gospels*: But they were never appointed to that *End*, and are not only incapable of *instructing* us, or being serviceable in the *Worship* of *God*, but are prohibited by *God*, and therefore no kind of *Reverence* can be due to 'em. And to *worship* 'em is to *worship Idols*, as has been sufficiently already prov'd.

Object.

Lastly, *Protestants* (say they) honour the *King's Chair* of *State*, and may not an *Image* of *Christ* and *Saints* as well deserve honour as an *inanimate Chair*.

Sol;

Answ. 1. There is a great deal of difference betwixt meer *Honour* and *Worship*, *Worship* implys as has been said *Submission* to the *Object*, which *Honour* do's not, and *Images* are requir'd to have, not only *Honour* but *Worship*. But *Honour* it self is not to be allow'd 'em because we are prohibited to *bow down* to 'em.

2. There

2. There is neither *Worship* nor *Honour* requir'd to be given to the *King's Chair of State*, but to the *King*, whose Command is obey'd by pulling off our Hats in the *Presence-Chamber*, where the *Chair* is plac'd. Did the *King* command the same to be done in other Places, it wou'd as much oblige the Subject to be uncover'd in those places. Did not the *King*, and Custom of the Court require, that such as go into the *Presence-Chamber*, shou'd take off their Hats, it wou'd be as *Lawful* to go through it without Ceremony, as through other *Chambers* in the Court.

CHAP. XI.

Containing a short History of the Beginning, Cause, and Progress of Image-Worship; together with a Conclusion to the whole Discourse.

THE first Promoter of Image-Worship was *Pope Gregory II.* about *Anno Dom. 700*, which occasion'd great Contentions in the *Christian Church*. The *Greek Emperors* *Leo Isauricus*, *Constantinus Caballinus*, *Nicephorus*, *Stauratin*, *Leo Armenius*, *Michael Balbus*, and *Theophilus*, Opposing them in the *East*; and *Pope Gregory II.* and *III.*, *Paul I.*, *Stephen IV.*, *Adrian I.* and *II.*, *Leo III.*, *Nicholas I.* and others, stiffly maintaining em in the *West*; hereon great *Rebellions* were rais'd against the *Emperors*.

About the Year 754, being a Considerable space of Time after Images stole into *Christian Churches*, and their Worship by several *Popes* advanc'd, there Assembled at *Constantinople* 338 *Bishops*, call'd the 6th Council, by which Council they were solemnly *Condemn'd*, and many Reasons insisted on by em to prove their *Unlawfulness*.

1. Because Christ came to deliver us from all *Idolatry*, and to teach the Worship of God in Spirit and Truth.

2. Because the Devil now not being able to reduce the World to the *Former Idolatry*, endeavours underhand to introduce it, under pretence of *Christianity*; bringing em again to the Worship of the Creature,

and making a God of a thing that is made, - which when they have made, they call it by the Name of *Christ*.

Against the making so much as the *Image* of *Christ*, the Council largely Argues: The Sum whereof is, " That because *Christ* is God and Man, the *Image* of *Christ* must needs be a lying *Image*, forasmuch as it cannot express his *Godhead*. So that either in such *Image* they divide the *Natures* of *Christ*, separating his *Godhead* from his *Humanity*, and so fall into the *Nestorian Heresy*; or else they must make the *Godhead* of *Christ* *Circumscribable*, and so with *Eutiches* confound his *Natures*.

Reason 3. " 3. Because there is no way of *Consecration* of 'em prescrib'd or practic'd.

Reason 4. " 4. Because there is no *Tradition* of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, or of the *Primitive Fathers* for 'em.

Reason 5. " 5. Because there is no suitableness in the use of 'em to the design of *Christianity*, which being in the middle between *Judaism* and *Paganism* it tasts of the *Sacrifice* of the one, and not only the *Sacrifices* but all the *Idolatry* of the other.

Reason 6. " 6. Because it's *Blasphemy* to the *Saints* in *Heaven* to call in *Heathen Superstitions*, into *Christianity* to Honour them by.

Reason 7. " 7. Because it's unbecomming their *Glory* in *Heaven* to be set upon *Earth* in dull and senseless *Statues*: That *Christ* himself wou'd not receive *Testimony* from *Devils*, tho' they Spake *Truth*; neither can such an *Heathenish Custom* be *Acceptable* to the *Saints* in *Heaven*, tho' pretended for their *Honour*.

Reason 8. " Lastly, Because there is nothing plainer in the *Gospel* then that *God* is a *Spirit*, and will be *Worship'd* in *Spirit and Truth*, to which nothing can be more *Contrary* than to go about to Honour him by *Worshipping* *Images* of himself and *Saints*.

About 35 Years after this Council there assembled 350 *Bishops* at *Nice* (as some Account, but only 306 as the *Caroline Books* inform us) call'd the *Second Nicene Council*; it was begun at *Constantinople*, and ended at *Nice*. In this Council *Images* and their *Worship* (without any *Disputation* or *Enquiry* into their *Lawfulness* or *Unlawfulness*) were establish'd; but not in that gross manner as they are at present in the *Roman Church*: for they admitted no *Images* of

of God the Father nor of the Trinity, as has been already shown; Their present Practice herein receives it's Confirmation from the Council of Trent.

The Reasons of their Establishments from this Council were neither drawn from Scriptures nor Authorities of Ancient Fathers, nor the practice of the Primitive Church, nor deductions from human reason, but fabulous Stories and pretended Visions and Revelations, made to Hypochondriacal Persons, of which we have two famous Instances in History.

The One of the Virgin Mary's appearing to Egwin Bishop of Worcester, and commanding him, that her Image shou'd be set up in Churches and Worship'd.

The Other of a certain Monk (quoted out of Sophronius Bishop of Jerusalem) who using to Worship an Image of the Virgin Mary holding Christ in her Arms, had been a long time tempted by the Devil to Fornication, to whom the Devil visibly appearing, told him in plain Terms (but under an Oath of Secrecy) that he wou'd never cease to vex him till he had left off Worshipping the Image of the Blessed Virgin. The good Monk (tho' he had sworn secrecy to the Devil) reveal'd it to one Theodore an Abbot, who told him, It were better for him to frequent all the Stews, then cease to Worship Christ and his Mother in an Image. A fit Story to lay the Foundation of Image-Worship.

About 7 Years after their Establishment by the Second Nicene Council, Charles the Great call'd a Council at Frankfort, in which Council by the Bishops of Italy, France and Germany, Images were condemn'd, and the Second Council of Nice declar'd no lawful Council.

About the Year 714, they were Establish'd in England, by a Synod held at London, under Bonifacius the Pope's Legate, and Bertwaldus Archbishop of Dover.

About the Year 794, they were Condemn'd by the Bishops of England.

They were also condemn'd by the Bishops of France assembled in Paris by Ludovick the Pious, upon the letters of Michael Balbus the Emperor, in order to the Union of Christendom.

But as the Power of Popes increas'd, so did the Credit of Images. And in the succeeding Ages, Image-Worship (with Transubstantiation, and Invocation of Saints) generally prevail'd in the Western as well as Eastern part of the Empire; and is at this Time, one great cause of Difference between the Romish and Reformed Churches, and the greatest

greatest hindrance of the Progress of Christianity, by being an horrible Scandal both to *Mahometans* and *Jews*.

To Conclude these Discourses, If the *Adoration* of the *Host*, the *Invocation* of *Saints*, and the *Worship* of *Images* be *Idolatry* (as has been prov'd in this Discourse) then do's our *Separation* from the *Roman Church* become our *Duty*.

Wherefore that thread-bare question (proposed by *Papists* to *Protestants*) *Where was your Religion before Luther?* deserves no other Answer than that it was in *Rome* till the *Worship of the Creature* turn'd out the *Worshippers* of the *True God* thence.

As to the *Visibility* of the *Church*, I wou'd only distinguish between it's *Visibility*, in respect of it's *Essence*, and in respect of it's *Soundness* and *Purity*. In respect of it's *Essence*, there has been a *Christian Church* visible wherever the *Essentials* of *Christianity* have been retain'd, tho' mix'd with heinous *Errors* and *Corruptions*. But in respect of it's *Soundness* and *Purity*, I am not oblig'd to believe it *Equally Visible* in all *Ages*. Nay, in some *Ages*, those that retain'd the *Purity* of *Divine Worship* have been visible to no

1. Kings 19. 14. *Eyes* but *God's*. Thus there was a time when a great *Prophet* in *Israel* cou'd not find a *Second* to make up a *Church* for *God*, till *God* told him he had reserv'd 7000 that had not bow'd their *Knees* to *Baal*: ~~And~~ *God* saw 'em tho' they were *Invisible* to *Elijah's Eyes*: And the *Church* of *God* was under

2. Chron. 21.
6. 11 v.

a *sadder Eclipse* when in *King Jehoram* and *King Ahaziah's* *Reign* the worship of *Baal* overspread not only the *Church* of *Israel* but also the *Church* of *Judah*.

2. Chron. 22.
3. 4 v.

And where was the *Visibility* of a *Pure* and *Holy Church* when *Arianism* overspread the *Whole World*, even *Rome* it self?

As to the *Universality* we ascribe in the *Creed* to the *Christian Church*, It may either respect *Place* or *Time*.

As it respects *Place*, so we own there has been a *True Church* where-ever the *Essentials* of *Christianity* have been retain'd in the several parts of the *Habitable World*. But then in some parts of the *World* the *Christian Church* has degenerated far more from it's *Primitive Purity* than in others, and no where more early and notoriously than in the *Roman Church*.

As to *Universality* of *Time*, We own that the *Christian Religion* as to it's *Essentials* has been professed in all *Ages* since

since the first Plantation of it: But as to it's *Degeneracy* on the Account of *sinful Additions* to it, and *Corruptions* of it, it has been of *long continuance* and of *great Extent* (according to the plain Predictions of the H. Scriptures concerning it). And the *Catholick Church* is denominated *Holy* from it's *Essentials*, and not from the *Corruptions* that too generally and too long prevail in it. Nor is the *long continuance* of those *corruptions* any reasonable *Objection* against a *necessary Reformation*. We have not lost our *Christianity* by purging it from those *corruptions* that had almost defaced the true beauty of it, but *restored* it to it's *Primitive Simplicity*. We are become thereby the *purest* and *soundest* part of the *Catholick Church*, and most conformable to the *Apostolical Age*.

The *Idolatry* of the *Ten Tribes* in *Worshipping the Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel* continu'd from *Jeroboam's* Time to their *Captivity*, which was about 250 Years. Suppose God had rais'd some *Instruments* in that time, by whose labours many had been convinc'd, and *relinquish'd* the *Worship of the Calves*; wou'd any *Roman Catholick* look upon it as an "Objection of Moment against such as had reform'd, That the *Worship* from which they had receded was the standing "Worship of God for some Hundred Years, That God wou'd "not have Suffer'd his Church to Err; That we are that True "Venerable Infallible Church. And in proof thereof the *Ten Tribes* had more to plead than the *Roman Church* at this Day can have: For in the *New Testament* God has no where promis'd to continue his Gospel to any *Place* or *People* longer than they shall deserve it; but in their Case there was a much stronger Plea of *Universality* for their *Corruptions*, and much clearer Promises of God's continuance with 'em, for *Abraham* and *Isaac* and *Jacob's* sake. If I cannot communicate with a Church without being guilty of *Idolatry*, I am commanded by God to Forsake it's Communion, tho' the *Idolatry* be of never so long Continuance. And Since I cannot go to *Mass* unless I Worship the *Crucifix*, Adore the *Host*, and on bended knees pray to *Saints* for *Aid* and *Help*, and that by their Merits I may be Sav'd, I will never come thither till those *Stumbling-Blocks* be remov'd. 1. Cor. 10. 14. 1. Joh. 5. 21.

In the mean Time I will Pray to God to open the Eyes of the *Roman Catholicks* of this Kingdom, and turn them from *Darkness* to *Light*, and from the *Power of Satan* unto God; That

That they may receive Remission of their Sins, and an Inheritance amongst them that are Sanctified thro' Faith in Christ Jesus, and that God wou'd so unite the Hearts of Christians, that his Churches may have Rest, and walking in the fear of God, and Comforts of the Holy Ghost may be Edify'd and Multiply'd.



FINIS.

A N

APPENDIX

Concerning the Pretended Sacraments of *Penance* and *Extreme Unction*.

TO these foregoing Discourses concerning *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, and *Image-Worship*, I have upon Second Thoughts judg'd it needful to subjoyn, by way of *Appendix*, some short Remarks on those two noted *Sacraments* of the *Romish Church*, viz. *Penance* and *Extream Unction*.

For their pretended Sacrament of *PENNANCE* I shall briefly lay down the Sum of what the *Council of Trent* teaches concerning it.

They distinguish between *Repentance* as a *Vertue*, and as a *Sacrament*. *Repentance* as 'tis a *Sacrament*, “ (they tell us) do's indeed include *Contrition* as one part of it. But it also includes *Confession* of *Sins to the Priest*, and such *Satisfaction to the Justice of God*, by the way of *Penance*, as the *Priest* thinks fit to enjoin; and on the *Priest's* part it includes his *Absolution*. The three foremention'd *Acts* of the *Penitent* they make to be the *Matter* of this pretended *Sacrament*, “ And the *Priest's Absolution* to be the *Form* of it.

Concerning *Contrition*, they distinguish between *perfect Contrition*, which flows from love to *God* (and therefore includes a *Real Change of Heart and Life*) and *Imperfect Contrition*, (or *Attrition* as they call it) which arises from the *Consideration of the Turpitude of Sin*, or most commonly from the fear of *Hell*. And accordingly on the one

A

hand

“ hand, they deny that our *Reconciliation* with God can
 “ be ascrib'd to that *Perfect Contrition*, without this Sa-
 “ *crament of Penance*, or at least the *Desire of it*. And on
 the other hand, “ They assert, that tho' this *Imperfect*
 “ *Contrition*, or *Attrition*, without the *Sacrament of Penance*,
 “ wou'd not put a Man into a justify'd State, yet it do's
 “ dispose a Man for Receiving *Absolution* in this *Sacra-*
 “ *ment of Penance*. i. e. Tho' of it self it cannot put a Man
 “ into a Pardon'd State, yet it can and will do it by the
 “ help of the *Priest's Absolution*.

Concerning *Confession*, That *Council* determines, “ That
 “ all Christians are oblig'd to confess to the Priest all their
 “ *Mortal Sins*, even the most secret of 'em. Nay, they Re-
 “ commend the Confession of what they call their *Venial*
 “ *Sins*, as highly useful. And in the Confession of their
 “ *Sins* they require an *Exact Enumeration* of all Cir-
 “ cumstances as far as they can recollect 'em. And who-
 “ ever deny this *Confession* to be *Instituted by Christ*, and by
 “ *Divine Right*, necessary to *Salvation*, they *Anathematize*, or
 “ *Curse*.

Concerning *Satisfaction*, They teach, “ That tho' God,
 “ for *Christ's* sake, forgive the *Eternal Punishment* due to
 “ *Sin*, yet every Man must make *Satisfaction* to *Divine*
 “ *Justice* for the *Temporal* part of the *Punishment* due to
 “ it, either by such *Punishments* as God *inflicts*, or such
 “ *Penance* as the *Priest enjoins*, or such *Voluntary Penance* as
 the *Person imposes on himself*. And such *Penance* consists of
 such *painful good Works* as are more than we are oblig'd by
 the *Divine Law* to perform (and therefore call'd *Works of*
Supererogation) such as *Alms*, *Fasting*, saying over so many
Prayers, and several *Bodily Austerities*, such as wearing
Hair-Cloth, *Disciplining* themselves with a *Whip*, &c.

Concerning *Absolution*, They teach, “ That tho' it be
 “ a *Dispensing a Benefit* that is not our own, yet 'tis not
 “ a bare *Ministry* either of *Preaching the Gospel* or *Decla-*
 “ *ring Men's Sins to be forgiven*; But 'tis a *Judicial Act* in
 “ which *Sentence* is pronounc'd by the *Priest* as a *Judge*.
 Nay, this *Judicial Power of Absolution* they ascribe to *wicked*
 “ *Priests* themselves. And they denounce their *Anathe-*
 “ *ma* against those that deny this.

And thus we have a *Sacrament* made up of *Contrition*,
Confession, and *Satisfaction* on the *Penitent's* part, and *Ab-*
solution on the *Priest's*. For



For the *Doctrine* of the *Reformed Churches* I need only give this *Brief Account* of it.

They distinguish between that *Secret Repentance* which is Transacted in the Court of every Man's Conscience, in which we have to do with *God alone*. And that *Profession of Repentance* which we are oblig'd to make before others. And that *Profession* is either more *private* in case of *Personal Injuries* and *Wrongs* done to others, or more *Publick* in case of such *Publick* and *Scandalous Offences*, whereby a Man brings a reproach on his Christian Profession, and by his Example endangers the Infection of others. In this latter *Case*, we own that a Man shou'd in order to the Repairing the injured Honour of Religion, and the preventing the Contagious Influence of his Evil Example, make a Profession of his Repentance, not *secretly* to the *Priest*, but *openly* in the face of the *Church*. But neither of these Cases concern *Auricular Confession* to a *Priest*. They do also own, That it may be expedient for a Man under any great Trouble of Conscience, in which he cannot resolve his own doubts, to consult his *Pastor*, or any other *Judicious Christian*, and so far to own his guilt as may enable them to pass a Satisfactory Judgment concerning his Case, or give him Advice suitable to it. But this implies no Obligation on any Man to confess *all his Secret Sins* whatever, with all their various *Circumstances*, to any *Priest* whatsoever. As to *Secret Repentance*, They Assert, That it cannot be *Sincere* unless it flow from the Love of *God*, and include a Real Change of a Man's Heart (turning it from the Love of Sin to the Love of *God* and Holiness) and unless it produce unfeigned Purposes and Endeavours of Actual Amendment of Life. And without such *Repentance* the *Absolution* of all the *Priests* in the World will never put a Man into a State of Pardon and Peace with *God*. And since no *Christian Pastors* know the Hearts of Men, their *Absolution* can only be *Ministerial* and *Declarative*, not *Judicial* and *Decisive*. For the *Doctrine* of *Satisfaction* to the Justice of *God* for the Temporal part of the punishment due to sin, they look upon it as many ways *absurd* and *dangerous*. Partly, as founded on a Proud Eroneus conceit of *Works of Supererogation*: Partly as injurious both to the plenary Satisfaction of *Christ*, and to the Extent of *Divine Mercy* in our *Forgiveness*. And upon the whole, they look up-

On it as no better than a Senseless and Ridiculous Folly to turn such a jumble of *Unscriptural Practices*, as *Auricular Confession*, *Human Satisfaction*, and *Priestly Judicial Absolution*, into a *Divine Sacrament*, when there is nothing in all this Parallel to those *Federal Rites* of Christian Religion, which we call *Sacraments*, such as *Baptism* and the *Lord's-Supper*.

Now against these *Doctrines* and *Practices* of the *Romish Church*, I shall offer the following Arguments to the serious Consideration of all the Members of that Church.

I. There is no Foundation for 'em in the Holy Scripture.

'Tis a strange Degree of Presumption for their *Councils* to make this *Secret Confession* of all *Mortal Sins* to a *Priest* necessary to *Salvation*, when they cannot produce one *Command*, nor one *Precedent* for it in all those *Sacred Writings*.

We indeed read of *Joshua's* requiring *Achan* to give *Glory unto God* by confessing his guilt. But the *Confession* was to be made not in the *Ear* of any *Jewish Priest*, but in the *Face of the Congregation*. See VII *Josh.* 19. 'Tis *Confession to God*, and not the *Priest*, that *Solomon* Recommends, 1 *Kings* VIII, from v. 35 to 50. And 'tis *Confession to God*, not a *Priest*, that *David* practis'd, L *Pf.* XXXII. *Pf.* It was upon *Secret Confession to God* that the *Publican* returned to his *House* justified. XVIII. *Luke* 13. And 'tis upon such *Penitent Confession to him* that *St. John* assures us of his *forgiveness*. 1 *John* I. 8.

'Tis true indeed, We read, that those that were *Baptiz'd* of *John* Confessed their *Sins*. But that *Confession of Sins* was antecedent to *Baptism*, (which is the true *Sacramental Rite*, in which an express *Renunciation of Sin* is indeed requir'd of all *Adult Persons*) and therefore belongs not to any pretended *Sacrament of Penance*. Nor do we read of this *Confession of Sins* being particular, which considering the Numbers he *Baptiz'd* is highly improbable. Nor was that *Confession* made secretly to *John*, but in the face of the *Assembly* met on that occasion of receiving his *Baptism*.

We read also at the XIX *Acts*, 18 v. of many that believed, who came and Confessed and shewed their *Deeds*. But that this has no relation to *Auricular Confession to a Priest* is manifest, if we consider, their *Magical Arts* are the only *Deeds* they confess'd. Their *Confession* was not secret to *St. Paul*, but publick. For to testify their abhorrence of those detestable

testable Deeds, they brought their (*Magical*) Books, and openly burnt 'em. Nor was the design of their Confession to procure *Priestly Absolution* from St. Paul, but to glorify God, who had by his Gospel turn'd 'em from *Darkness to Light*, and from the power of Satan to the living God.

We do also find, that St. James enjoyns Christians to confess their Faults to one another, V James, 16. But that this Text gives no countenance to *Auricular Confession* is hence evident, That the Advice is directed to *private Christians*. And therefore if it prove any thing to the purpose of *Auricular Confession*, it proves every *private Christian* to be a Priest. This Confession relates to *private Offences and Wrongs*, and is therefore to be made to the *offended Party*, not to the Priest. And as this Text do's not oblige us to Confess all our *secret Sins* whatever to one another, so much less can it oblige us to Confess 'em to the Priest, who is not so much as mention'd in the Text.

And there is as little Ground in the *Holy Scriptures* for *Human Satisfaction* to Divine Justice, to be enjoyn'd by the Priest to all Penitents.

What tho' Daniel Exhort *Nebuchadnezar*, to break off his Sins by righteousness (for so the Original shou'd be rendred) and his Iniquities by shewing Mercy to the Poor, IV Dan. 27. These words contain no more than an Exhortation to serious Amendment of Life, in order to our obtaining pardon from God, but do not suppose those Dutys to be Works of Supererogation, much less ascribe any such vertue to 'em as that of *satisfying Divine Justice*.

Solomon do's indeed tell us, That by Mercy and Truth, Iniquity is purged, XVI Prov. 6. But if by Mercy and Truth, there be understood the Mercy and Truth of God, this signifies nothing to prove *Human Satisfaction*, but rather proves the contrary. And if by Mercy and Truth we understand these Graces in our selves, they are commanded Dutys, not Works of Supererogation; And the utmost that the words can import, is, that they are conditions requisite to our obtaining Divine Forgiveness, but that by no means implys their being Satisfactory to Divine Justice.

John the Baptist do's indeed urge those that came to his Baptism to bring forth fruits meet for Repentance, III Luke 8. But this only implys such genuine Effects of true Repentance that might manifest the sincerity of it. Not such Works as God never commanded, much less such as cou'd make any compensation to his Injur'd Justice.

God

God is indeed often said to remove his Judgments upon Men's *Humiliation*, and *Fasting*, and *Prayer*. But then there is a vast difference between such *Means* as are appointed and requir'd by God, to *dispose* us for his *Mercy*, and render us *meet Objects* of it, and such *Works* as are capable to *satisfie his Justice*. As particularly, *Humiliation*, and *Fasting*, and *Prayer*, are *Duties* actually enjoin'd to all *Offending Sinners*; and therefore are neither *Works of Supererogation*, nor can on that Account be *Satisfactory*.

Much less have we one Instance in all the Bible of any, either *Jewish Priest*, or *Christian Pastor*, either *Imposing* such *Penance* on any *Penitents*, or of *Enjoyning* it under any such proud conceit of Men's making any *Compensation to Divine Justice* thereby. The Inspired Pen-Men only requir'd Men to flee to the Infinite Mercy of God, thro' a *Mediator*, with that sincere *Repentance*, which was their *Commanded Duty*, and Necessary to make 'em *meet Objects of Divine Forgiveness*.

And for the *Argument* drawn from the Power of *Remitting* and *Retaining Sins* given to the *Apostles*, 'tis far from *Warranting* any *Priest* to enjoin such *Human Satisfaction*: For if it did, this gross *Absurdity* wou'd thence follow, That they shou'd *remit* and *retain* the *Sins* of the *same Person* at the *same time*. They wou'd at the same time *remit the Sins of the Penitent by Absolution*, and yet *retain 'em, by requiring Satisfaction to divine Justice for 'em*. Whereas these two are *Contradictory*. The Text plainly supposes no Man's sins *re-mitted and retain'd at the same time*; much less *Remitted* as to some part of the *Punishment*, and *Retain'd* as to the other.

And for *Judicial Priestly Absolution*, if it have any *Foundation* in the Holy Scriptures, it must be in these *Remarkable Words* of our Blessed Saviour, *X. Joh. 22, 23. Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted; and whose sins soever ye retain, they are retained*. Now if this Passage do not prove any such thing as *Judicial Priestly Absolution*, we may justly conclude that no other does.

To shew that it does not, I wou'd first compare this with those other Passages wherein Christ gives for Substance the *same Commission* to his Apostles.

* XXVIII. That in the Evangelist *Matthew* * runs thus, *Go ye and Disciple all Nations, Baptizing 'em in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and Teaching 'em to observe all things whatever I have Commanded you, &c.*

That

That in the Evangelist *Mark* * runs thus, *Go ye into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature ; He that Believes and is Baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believes not, shall be Damned.* * XVI c. 15, 16. v.

That in the Evangelist *Luke* * runs thus, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third Day ; and that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be Preach'd in his Name among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are Witnesses of these things.* * XXIV c. 46, 47, 48 v.

Now from hence I argue, if our Blessed Saviour in that Passage recorded in *St. John*, gave his Apostles no other, or larger Commission and Power, than in the Passages recorded by the Three other Evangelists ; Then he gave 'em no other Authority to remit Sins, than what is Ministerial and Declarative. i. e. To assure all true Penitents in his Name of Divine Forgiveness, and to Seal the Promise of Divine Forgiveness to all true Penitents by Baptism. For 'tis Evident, that all the other Passages of the other Evangelists, which deliver the same Commission, import no more than this. They empower 'em in his Name to Publish Salvation to all that Believe, and Remission to all that Repent ; and by that Sacred Rite of Baptism to invest 'em in this Privilege, on Supposition, that they be truly such believing Penitents as they profess themselves.

If it be pretended, that these Words of the Evangelist *St. John* import any higher power than that of Ministerial or Declarative Remission, then they must imply such a Judicial Power, as supposes their Sentence to be always valid and decisive, on whomsoever it is pronounced. If so, then either this Judicial Power was peculiar to the Apostles, or not. If peculiar to them, no Priests have any thing to do with it. If it was not peculiar to them, but to be Transmitted to all Priests in every succeeding Age ; then it will follow, that every Priest has it in his power to Absolve those whom the Gospel Condemns. And consequently, that our Blessed Saviour has given 'em a Power Superior to his own, even of Counteracting and Reversing his own Rule of Final Judgment. For if the Priest's power be not merely Declarative, but Judicial, it must secure all those from Eternal Punishment whom they Absolve. Now either the Priest has an Infallible Knowledge, whether those that Confess to him are Sincere Penitents, or he has not. To say he has, were to ascribe to him the

the incommunicable Priviledge of the *Blessed God*, the *only Searcher of Hearts*. If he has not, then he may mistake an *Hypocritical Penitent*, for a *Sincere one*; and consequently *Absolve* him upon a *feigned Profession* and *shew* of that *Repentance* which he really has not. And consequently he may by this *Sentence of Absolution*, secure an *Impenitent Sinner* from that *Eternal Condemnation* to which he is by the *Threatnings* of the Gospel obnoxious.

And in this Case, I wou'd Enquire whose *Sentence* shall at last be ratify'd and stand? The *Sentence of Christ* that has excluded all *Impenitent Sinners* (whatever *Hypocritical Profession* they make) from *Divine Forgiveness*? Or the *Priest's* that has upon mistake given many of 'em *Judicial Absolution*? If the *Priest's Sentence* be ratify'd, the whole *Tenour* of the *Gospel-Threatnings* is false. And the *Priest* has it in his power to *Absolve* those whom our *Saviour* has said he will condemn, and consequently the *Priest* can annul and reverse the *Sentence* of the *Universal Judge* himself. If *Christ's own Sentence* shall be ratify'd, then it is evident, that the *Priest* can *absolve* none but the *truly Penitent*, nor will any *Penitent Sinner* be damn'd tho' he shou'd deny him *Absolution*. And consequently his power of *Remission* cannot be *Judicial* and *Decisive*, and absolutely secure this great *Benefit* to all whom he *Absolves*. It can only be *Ministerial* and *Declarative*, conveying this *Benefit* only on supposition of *Men's* being by *Sincere Faith* and *Repentance* entitled to it according to the *Tenour* of the *Promises* of the Gospel. And of how pernicious consequence their pretending to such a *Judicial Power* is to the *Deceiving* and *Damning Millions* of *Souls* that rely upon it, I shall have fuller occasion to shew, when I come to consider on what *Terms* they dispence their pretended *Judicial Absolution*.

Having thus shewn, that the *Matter* and *Form* of this pretended *Sacrament* are *Unscriptural*; I now add,

II. That this pretended *Sacrament of Penance* has no *Foundation* in *Primitive Antiquity*, and is but a gross *Corruption* of the *Discipline* of the *Ancient Church*.

Those of the *Romish Church* are wont to Boast much of *Catholick Traditions* for those *Doctrines* and *Practices*, which they can find no *Evidence* for in the *Holy Scriptures*, and particularly for this. Whereas there is scarce any one Instance

Instance wherein they have more notoriously *Deviated* from, and *Depraved* the Practice of the *Antient Church*.

In the *Primitive Church*, when any Christian had Relapsed into *Pagan Idolatry*, or committed any such heinous Crime, as *Murder, Adultery, &c.* They were publickly excluded from the Communion of the Church, and were not readmitted to it upon any slight Profession of their Repentance, but were oblig'd to give such *External Signs* of it as might render that *Profession credible*. Thus these *Penitents* were wont to stand at the Church-Doors, in a Garb and Posture and Carriage that might Express their just Shame and Humiliation, begging the Prayers of the Faithful, and earnestly soliciting to be admitted to the Churches Communion. These *External Marks* of Repentance were call'd *Canonical-Satisfactions*, (because certain *Rules* were prescrib'd whereby they were continued for a longer or shorter time in the State of *Penitents*, according to the Degree of their Heinous Crime) But the *Design* of this *Canonical Satisfaction* was not at all to compensate the *Wrong* done to the *Justice of God* for the *Temporal Punishment* due to Sin, but to *Evidence* the *Sincerity* of their Repentance to the *Satisfaction* of the Church, to whose Communion they desired to be restor'd, to deter others from the like Crimes, and to remove the Scandal thereby brought on Christianity by manifesting that it gave no allowance to such Enormous Sins. And these *Canons* were at first screw'd up to so great Rigour, that Offenders were usually kept some years in the State of *Penitents*, and no *Absolution* usually granted in Case of a *Second Relapse*.

But now in the *Romish Church* this *Sacred Discipline* is wholly perverted and deprav'd.

That *Confession of Sins*, and *Declaration of Repentance*, which the *Primitive Church* requir'd only in Case of open and scandalous Crimes, is now turn'd into a *Confession of all Sins* call'd *Mortal* (even the most secret of 'em) in order to the Subjecting the Consciences of the *Laity* more entirely to their *Priests*. Only to reconcile the *Laity* the better to this new Slavery, That *Publick Confession* which shou'd be made in the face of the *Christian Church* by such as have given *Publick Scandal*-thereto, is turn'd into *Auricular Confession* to the *Priest*. And instead of those *External Signs*

whereby such *Penitents* were to testify the Truth of their *Repentance* to the Satisfaction of the Church, a new kind of *Satisfactions* came in consisting in pretended *Works of Supererogation*, whereby *Penitents* were suppos'd to make a *Compensation to Divine Justice* for the Temporal part of the punishment due to their Sins. And these *Satisfactions* are now to be enjoyn'd at the Arbitrary Pleasure of the Priest. Nay, whereas the Church always requir'd such evident *Signs of Repentance*, in order to the penitents obtaining publick Absolution. Now the Priest absolves the Penitent first, before he has perform'd the *Penance* that is enjoyn'd. And that publick Absolution whereby such *Penitents* were restored to the Communion of the Church (and which was accompany'd with their Joint-Prayers for Divine Forgiveness) is now turn'd into the private Absolution of the Priest, which is pretended to be a judicial act, whereby he frees the Penitent from the ^{temporal} punishment due to sin. Such a strange Medley of palpable Corruptions of the Antient Discipline goes up to make this their pretended Sacrament of Penance (or Repentance). Nay, whereas in some Cases the Rigor of those Penitential Canons was relax'd, where the Repentance of the Offender was remarkable, and that Relaxation was call'd by the Name of Indulgence: This has given the rise to a new Corruption. For the Satisfaction that was to be given to the Church being chang'd into a Pretended Satisfaction to the Justice of God for the Temporal part of the Punishment due to Sin, the Romish Church has pretended to a Power of granting such Indulgences as shall discharge a Man in whole, or in part, from the Temporal Punishment due to Sin. This Practice of giving Indulgences was first begun by the Roman Bishops, and they were bestow'd on such as Espons'd their Quarrels against their Enemies. And their Doctrine being not then so refin'd as 'tis now, the Popes usually blunder'd so far as to promise not only Remission of all Sins but an Eternal Reward to all that fought in their Cause. This practice being taken up by the Popes, private Bishops were willing to assume a share in this power; And hence when they had a Church to build or repair, or other Pious Work to carry on, out came an Indulgence to pardon Men the 7th, 4th, or 3d, part of their Sins, according to the Degree of their Charitable Contribution. But the Bishops of Rome finding how beneficial

beneficial these Indulgences were, resolv'd to keep the *Keys* of this *Treasury* in their own Hands. And to that purpose *Innocent* the 3d. in the *Council of Lateran*, Can. 62 Decrees, "That in the Dedication of a Church, tho' there were "several *Bishops* together, they shou'd not grant an Indulgence above a Year, nor a single *Bishop* above Forty Days. But tho' the *Popes* ty'd the hands of other *Bishops* they ty'd not their own, but were too wise to let others have the managing so rich a Stock as brought in such an incredible Harvest of Wealth from the Sins of the credulous Laity. And that there might appear some futable Fund for these Indulgences, they pretend a *Treasury* in the Church made up, partly of the *Redundant Merits of Christ*, and partly, of the *superfluous Satisfactions of the Saints*, which they tell us may be applied to those that want 'em. And the Dispensing of this Rich *Treasure* to be sure is chiefly reserv'd to the *Roman Bishops*. And whereas it might be objected, That if these Indulgences could secure a Man from the *Temporal Punishments* due to Sins, then it might be expected that a *plenary Indulgence* should secure a Man from all those Afflictions of Life which they reckon a part of that *Temporal Punishment*, (whereas all the Indulgences all the *Popes* can give are no Security from a Fit of the Gout or Stone).

To obviate this Scurvy Objection, and to keep up the Credit of Indulgences, they have very conveniently set up the *Doctrine of Purgatory*, where Men that had not fully satisfy'd Divine Justice in this World, are suppos'd to satisfy it in the next, by enduring Pains equal to those of Hell (in degree, tho' not in duration) till they are releas'd by *Masses* and Indulgences. So that tho' Indulgences can do a Man no Service in this World where our Afflictions are real, yet they can do wonders in that imaginary Place of Torment in the other World. And thus a Senseless and Erroneous Opinion is advanc'd to support the Credit of a most shameful Practice that long gave a Publick Scandal to the Christian World, till at last the apparent cheat of it open'd Men's Eyes, and prepar'd the Way for a Glorious and Happy Reformation. I have insisted the longer on this only to shew, To what wretched purposes this *Doctrine of Human Satisfactions* has serv'd, which those of the *Romish Church* make a part of this *Sacrament of Penance*. Upon

the whole, They must be entire Strangers to the *practice* of the *Antient Church*, who can see any real *Conformity* in this *Popish Sacrament of Penance* to it. Their gross *Deviation* from it, and *Depravation* of it, being so notorious in the *Instances* I have mention'd.

I now add,

III. That this pretended Sacrament of Penance makes that necessary to our obtaining Forgiveness from God which he never made so.

On what Terms a Gracious God is willing to Forgive is Evident from the Tenor of his Promises. Now 'tis the Language thereof, *Let the Wicked forsake his Way, and the Unrighteous Man his Thoughts, and turn to the Lord; and he will have Mercy on him, and to our God, and he will abundantly pardon.* *

* IV II. 7.

* III Acts 19.

* I John I. 9.

*may be blotted out, * &c. If we confess our Sins, * (i. e. to God) he is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness. Be it known unto you therefore, Men and Brethren, that thro' this Man is Preach'd unto you the Forgiveness of Sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye cou'd not be justified*

* XIII. Acts by the Law of Moses. *

38, 39:

Now if these Promises be true, then all Believing Penitents are assur'd of *Divine Forgiveness*, having comply'd with the Terms on which it is offer'd.

But how can this consist with the Doctrine of the Romish Church concerning this Sacrament? When a Penitent Confession to God will not serve without a Confession to the Priest? And when our Sincere Repentance it self still leaves us under an Obligation to satisfy Divine Justice for all the Temporal Punishment that our Sins have deserved? How comes such a Confession to the Priest to be necessary to Divine Forgiveness, when 'tis never once mention'd in the Bible, never so much as enjoin'd or recommended, and much less made a necessary Condition of Pardon from God? Nay, since they suppose, That God insists, notwithstanding our sincere Repentance, upon a Satisfaction to his Justice for the Temporal Punishment due to Sin, Why do they not leave him to exact it himself? Where has he given the Priest any Power to demand it, and enjoin what Penance he pleases for that End? How comes the Priest by an Authority to retain those Sins as to any part of their Punishment

ment which God has promis'd upon our Faith and Repentance fully to remit? As if *Satisfaction* were due to the *Priest* as well as *him*. What unsupportable Arrogance is this, *First*, to impose without any Divine Warrant, a most grievous and unreasonable *Yoke* upon the Consciences of Men, and then make their Submission to it a necessary Condition of *Divine Forgiveness*! As if it were in the power of the Romish Clergy to prescribe to the Almighty himself on what Terms he shall receive his Offending Creatures into Favour! And we must be beholding for his *Pardon* to their *Judicial Absolution*! Nay, (as I shall more fully shew under the next Head) They have made their *Arbitrary Terms* more necessary to our Forgiveness than the *Conditions* which God himself has prescrib'd. For according to them we may be *pardoned without* that true Repentance which the Gospel requires. But we cannot *without* that *Auricular Confession* and *Priestly judicial Absolution* which the Gospel never enjoyn'd, tho' the Romish Church has. But this leads me to the main Charge I wou'd bring against this pretended *Sacrament of Penance*, viz.

IV. This Doctrine tends to the Deceiving and Daming Millions of Souls by Encouraging 'em to depend on the *Priest's Absolution* for *Divine Forgiveness* without that *Sincere Repentance* which the Gospel makes absolutely necessary to obtain it.

The Gospel never promises Forgiveness on lower Terms than *Faith in a Mediator* and *Repentance towards God*. This Repentance cannot be *Sincere* unless it turn the Bent of a Man's Heart from the Predominant Love of Sin to the Predominant Love of God and Holiness, and do engage him to unfeigned Purposes and Endeavours of Universal Obedience to the Divine Commands. And this is what those of the Romish Church call *Perfect Contrition* that springs from the Love of God. The Council of Trent were aware, that where there is such a *Perfect Contrition* or *Sincere Repentance*, the Promises of the Gospel do secure God's Absolution to the true Penitent. And then the Priest cou'd have nothing to do but to declare those absolv'd whom God had absolv'd before. And consequently the Priest's Absolution can be only Declarative, not Judicial (as many of the Popish Divines had before the sitting of that Council publicly taught). But if something less than this perfect Contrition or true Repentance will dispose a Man for the Priest's Absolution, and

and that *Absolution* be judicial and decisive, and such as God himself will always v^{er}ify, then the *Priest's* Power of *Absolution* is of vast consequence, and can put those into a pardon'd and justify'd State who fall short of that true *Repentance* which the Gospel requires.

* The Council of Trent Examined and Disprov'd by Catholic Tradition, p. 90, 91.

And from hence came the Opinion (as Dr. *Stillington*, the Learned Bishop of Worcester well observes *) that *Attrition* (i. e. such a sorrow for Sin as arises from the consideration of the turpitude of it, or from the present fear of Hell) which *Absolution* was sufficient without that perfect *Contrition* which true *Repentance* do's necessarily include. And those (as that Judicious Author observes) do not well understand the Council of Trent's Doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Penance, who deny it. For in the 4th Chapter concerning *Contrition*, they distinguish between perfect and imperfect *Contrition*. Perfect *Contrition* they suppose to flow from a Real Hatred of Sin and Love to God. This perfect *Contrition* they own does reconcile a Man before he actually receive this Sacrament of Penance (i. e. before the *Priest's* *Absolution*). But then they pretend (tho' very falsely) that our Reconciliation with God is not to be ascrib'd to this *Contrition* without a desire of this Sacrament, which they say, is included in it. But what if a Man fall short of this perfect *Contrition* or Sincere *Repentance*? For the Relief and Encouragement of such, they add, That for that imperfect *Contrition* or *Attrition*, because it usually arises either from the consideration of the Turpitude of Sin, or from the fear of Hell and Punishment, if there be not a purpose of going on in sin, and it be accompanied with hope of Forgiveness, Then the Synod declares, That tho' without this Sacrament it cou'd not of itself bring a Man into a justified State, yet it do's dispose him for obtaining the Grace of God in this Sacrament. And to this purpose they alledg the Example of the Ninevites, who being terrified at the Preaching of *Jonah* Repented, and obtained Pardon.

Now 'tis evident, That many thousands have this imperfect *Contrition* or *Attrition*, who fall short of true *Repentance*. Many under Convictions and Pangs of Conscience are asham'd of their sins, and are under some fears of the Eternal Vengeance due to 'em; And under these Terrors they are so far from any present purpose of persisting in their sins, that they take up some present Resolutions of forsaking 'em. (Which is more then that Council supposes necessary to *Attrition*) And

And yet after all, as soon as these pangs are over, their Terrors vanish, their good purposes are forgotten, and their goodness proves only as the Morning-cloud, and the Early dew that soon goes away. * So that the Council might very well * VI Hof: 4 say, that this imperfect Contrition (or Attrition) cou'd not of it self bring a Man into a justify'd state. For God has no where promis'd Pardon on the Condition of such Attrition. But if their Doctrine be true the Priest's Absolution can effect what God's promise cou'd never do. For this bare Attrition disposes a Man for obtaining the Favour or Grace of God in this Sacrament, by virtue of the Priest's Absolution. Now we know, That according to the 7th and 8th Canons of that Council concerning Sacraments in general, all their Sacraments are suppos'd to confer the Grace signify'd by 'em to all that rightly receive 'em, and that by the virtue of the *opus operatum*, or the External Administration. And they here assert all that bring Attrition to be rightly dispos'd for the Grace that is to be conferr'd by this Sacrament of Penance, which is no less then Forgiveness of Sins and Reconciliation with God.

And for the Example of the Ninevites which the Council alledges to countenance this abominable Doctrine, 'tis nothing at all to the purpose. For either the Ninevites had perfect Contrition or true Repentance, and then they were on the account thereof truly reconcil'd to God. Or else they had only this imperfect Contrition, or Attrition, as the Council here plainly supposes (and which, as I have shewn, falls short of true Repentance). If they had only the Latter, Then all the benefit they deriv'd from it, was only the Averting that Temporal Vengeance they were threatned with, But by no means Their Reconciliation with God, and Absolution from Eternal Vengeance. Now we know, That God has upon an External Humiliation, which falls short of True Repentance, forbore to execute his Temporal Judgments, even on those that have still remain'd expos'd to his Eternal Vengeance. As in the Case of Ahab. See 2 Kings. XXI. 29.

Upon the whole, If such bare Attrition dispose Men for the Grace that is to be conferr'd in the Sacrament of Penance, and the Priest's Absolution can restore such to that Reconciliation with God, which the Gospel promises only to the Truly Penitent, Then indeed, 'Tis no wonder that those shou'd be desirous of the Priest's Absolution, and so willing to rely on it, who are unwilling to come up to the uneasy Terms of

of that *True Repentance* which the Gospel prescribes. What Man almost is there so stupid, but upon review of his Sins feels some *Motions of shame* and *fear of Eternal Punishment*, and that do's not under those pangs take up some *purposes of Amendment*. And if these be sufficient to restore him to the favour of God without any real Change of Heart and Life, Then what necessity is there of any *Renovation of our Nature* or *Reformation of our Lives*? 'Tis but for the pretended *Penitent* under the next *Terror* or *Pang of Conscience*, to run with his *Confession* to the *Priest*, and obtain his *Absolution*, and do the *External Penance* he enjoyns, and all his *past scores* are *clear'd*. And this *torres quotes*. Who then wou'd be concern'd to mortify his Lusts, and abandon his Sinful Course, and practise all the strict Rules of an Holy and Heavenly Life, who has so much *Easier* and *shorter a way* before him, as that of *Attrition, Confession, Absolution* and *satisfaction*? No Man according to this Doctrine runs any greater hazard of Damnation then so short a Warning as gives him no Time to send for a *Confessor*, and obtain his *Absolution*. No wonder that this Doctrine shou'd be so generally embrac'd by those that *live ill* and yet desire to *dye well*. 'Tis so suited to the Inclinations of Corrupt Nature that he must be a very perverse Wretch that wou'd desire an easier way to Heaven then this. And 'tis rather to be admired that every Wicked Man is not of this Religion, than that so many are tenacious of it. And what is the Natural tendency of their Asserting the *Priest's Absolution* to be *Judicial*, but to Encourage all their *Proteelytes* to rely upon it? If it be always *valid*, scarce any of those call'd *Roman Catholicks* can be *Damn'd*. And yet if persisting in a wicked Life can secure their Damnation, As few of 'em in comparison are like to escape it as any other Denomination of Christians whatever. If the *Priest's Absolution* be not *valid*, but on supposition of the Penitents *perfect Contrition* or *sincere Repentance*; Then how many Millions are gull'd with false and delusive Hopes, and depend for their Eternal Salvation on a meer *broken Reed*? And how plainly is this Corrupt Doctrine of their *Council* chargable with all these pernicious consequences of it to the *deception* and *ruine* of innumerable Souls! How plainly do's this Doctrine subvert the Gospel of Christ? What a fatal *Opiate* do's it prove to stupify the Consciences of

of Wicked Men, in very few of whom this *Attrition* is not to be found, and whom 'tis suppos'd by vertue of the *Priest's Absolution* to put into as truly a *pardon'd and justify'd State* as the most *Sincere Repentance* cou'd have done? And to believe such Doctrine as this do's indeed argue Men to be given up to strong *Delusions* to believe a *Lye*. For 'tis as certainly a *Lye*, as that the *Gospel* it self is true.

V. Their Doctrine concerning this Sacrament has given rise to a vast number of *Corrupt* and *Superstitious Practices*, and is wholly calculated for the purposes of *Ecclesiastical Tyranny* and *Avarice*.

For their Doctrine of *Auricular Confession* (and that of all Sins call'd *Mortal*, even the most secret of 'em) being absolutely necessary to *Salvation*, what an intollerable Yoke

do's this lay upon the Necks of the poor *Laity*! What a Degree of *Blindness* and *Infatuation* do's it argue in 'em

that they have ever been brought to submit so tamely to it! † What is the Tendency of it but to *Enlarge* and *Establish*

the *Authority* of the *Romish Clergy* by *Enslaving* the *Con-*

sciences of the *Laity* to 'em, and making 'em *Masters* of

the *Secrets* of all *Familys*? Nay, of the *Courts* of *Princes* themselves? They have hereby an admirable *Pick-Lock* to

open the *Cabinet* of every Man's *Breast*, and view all the

Privacys of his *Heart* and *Life*. Besides their

Doctrine about it tends to involve the *Consciences* of their

Prolelytes in miserable perplexitys to distinguish between

Mortal and *Venial Sins*, and to know when they have suffi-

ciently rifled their *Consciences* by enumerating all the *par-*

ticular Circumstances of their *secret Sins*. And particularly,

as they have brought all Sins against the *7th Command-*

ment into the Number of *Mortal Sins*, so none that read

all the *Curious Cases* which their *Casuists* sonically examine,

and all the *Questions* they direct a *Father Confessor* to pro-

pose to his *Penitent* concerning 'em, but mult be easily

convinc'd what an advantage is hereby given to *Licentious*

Priests (and all their *Priests* are far from being *Saints*) to

insinuate into and corrupt those of the *Weaker Sex* who

are generally observed to frequent the *Confessionals* much

more than the Men. It were easy from *History* to Il-

† Cardinal Bellermino was so sensible of this, that he makes the *Laity's* tame submission to it one of his Arguments to prove the *Divine Right* of it. As if it were any new or strange thing for cunning *Priests* to impose unreasonable and grievous things on the *Consciences* of the credulous *Laity* when they had done their utmost to hoodwink 'em. So did the *Heathen Priests* persuade poor *Parents* to Sacrifice their *Children* to their *Idols*.

C

illustrate

So did the *Jewish Priests* bind grievous burdens and hard to be born on the *Shoulders* of Men. So did *Mahomet* oblige his Followers to the painful Rite of *Circumcision*, and to a perpetual *Abstinence* from *Wine*.

illustrate this Truth with innumerable Instances of this kind. 'Tis sufficient to observe, that their Gravest *Authors* do loudly complain of it, and represent their *Confessionals* as the very *School of Impurity*, in which (as *Camus* particularly ob-

* Relect. de Penit. c. 6. * Exhomo. T. 5. p. 128, 129. serves *) *The manner of Sinning was learn'd rather than that of Confessing or Repenting.* * *Erasmus* laments this unhappy Effect of *Auricular Confession* in his Time. And this grievous Inconvenience of it has occasion'd two Bulls, the one of Pope *Pius IV.* A. D. 1591, the other of Pope *Gregory the XV.* 1622. The *Former* is levell'd against many Priests in *Spain* that took the Advantage of *Auricular Confession* to solicit Women to Leudness. And the *Later* confirms the Decree of Pope *Pius* extending it at all other parts of

* Tract. de Confess. sollicit. in Exordio & passim.

the *Romish* Communion. And * *Escobar* in his Commentary on those 2 Bulls gives a lamentable Account how generally Confessions had been made use of to this vile and abominable purpose. I might cite a great Number of other unsuspected *Popish Authors* who make the same Complaint. But the Inconvenience of the thing speaks it self. To have such Scenes of secret Impurity open'd to 'em can be no pleasing Entertainment to any modest and virtuous Priests. And to others, it may be too grateful, and carry too strong Incentives for 'em to resist. So that it were much safer to take away *Auricular Confession* than to propose such ineffectual Methods to prevent the gross Abuses which so naturally flow from it. And then for the Priest's Absolution 'tis scarce imaginable what a Blind Devotion the *Lairy* pay 'em on this Score. And no wonder that those keep their Consciences in so absolute and blind a Slavery whom they regard as the Judges by whose Mouth their Decisive Sentence of Absolution must be pronounc'd.

But above all, Their Doctrine of *Human Satisfaction* has been the most fruitful Source of innumerable Superstitions. 'Tis this which (as I have shewn) has brought the scandalous Cheat of *Indulgences* into to general Credit and Reputation. 'Tis this kindled the Imaginary Flames of *Purgatory*, and to this Day keeps up the Superstitious dread of 'em. 'Tis this keeps up the Price of those *Private Masses*, that are said for the Redemption of miserable Souls there. Nay, 'tis this Doctrine that gives the *Romish Priests*, and especially their Religious Orders the Advantage of using a thousand Art fices to draw Offerings from the Credulous *Lairy*, on pretence

of *any Device* or *other* to alleviate those imaginary pains, or hasten their speedier Release from 'em. And then for the Conceit of these pretended *Works of Supererogation* (which they suppose *Satisfactory to the Justice of God*) as it swells their *Religious Orders* with excessive *Pride*, on pretence of their great Stock of *Merits* this way; (and on that Account heightens the Veneration pay'd 'em by the ignorant Laity;) so it greatly tends to corrupt their Notions of *true Religion*, which they place far more in the observance of *Human Traditions*, in needless, and often ridiculous *Austerities*, than in the Substantial Dutys of *Piety, Justice, Charity, Sobriety, and Heavenly Mindness*. And hence we see with what Nauseous Stuff the Lives of their pretended *Saints* are filled up, which tends only to give all wise Men such an *Idea* of the *Christian Religion* as renders it rather *Foolish and Contemprable* than truly *Great and Venerable*. As if *Hair-Shirts, and Ropes, and Whips, and a ridiculous fantastical Garb*, as if senseless cruelty to our Bodies, and even *Nastiness* it self, were the greatest *Instruments of Piety*, and truest *Exercises* of the *Highest Devotion*, and signify'd much more to Commend us to the Great God, than *Loving him with all our Heart and Soul, &c. and Loving our Neighbours as our selves*. Now nothing tends more to deprave Men's Notions of the *Christian Religion* than to place the very height and perfection of it in such *Works* as the *Author* of it never once commanded, and such as signify nothing to make us the wiser or better.

How little do such consider that Excellent and Noble Description of it given us by *St. Paul*, when he tells us, *that the Kingdom of God stands not in Meats and Drinks, but in Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost, XIV. 22.*

Having Enlarg'd beyond what I first Design'd on the Pretended *Sacrament of Penance*, I shall only subjoyn a few short *Remarks* on that other Pretended *Sacrament of EXTREME UNCTION*.

For this Rite of *Extreme Unction*, The *Council of Trent* asserts it to be a true and proper *Sacrament*, especially instituted for those that are *dying*, and to cleanse 'em from all the Relicks of *Sin*, and to convey pardon to 'em. And they curse all that deny this, or say, that this Ceremony belong'd only to the Gift of *Healing*.

* I exorcise thee, O unclean Spirit, and all Incur-sion of Satan or Phantom, in the name of the Father, &c. that thou depart from this Oyl, that it may be a Spiritual unction to corroborate the Temple of the living God that the Holy Spirit may dwell therein; In the Name, &c.

The Matter of this Sacrament must be *Oyl of Olive*, and that consecrated by the Bishop on a certain day, and with a *Form of Words* that looks much more like a *Magical Charm* than a *Divine Mystery* * Nay, to make the Charm more effectual, it must be *Nine times Blessed*, thrice with an *Ave Sanctum Oleum*, thrice with an *Ave Sanctum Chrisma*, and thrice with an *Ave Sanctum Balsamum*.

With this Oyl the Council of Florence ordains, That the Priest Anoint the Seats of the Five Senses, the Reins as the Seat of Concupiscence, and the Feet on the part from this Account of their Executing what the Mind resolves.

The Form of this pretended Sacrament they place in those words pronounc'd by the Priest. *By this Holy unction, and by his most Pious Mercy, God forgive thee, whatever thou hast offended by thy seeing, &c.*

Now that we have no Divine Warrant for this Pretended Sacrament of *Extreme unction*, will appear on these following Considerations.

1. We never read in Scripture of this Rite of *Anointing with Oyl* being us'd, but in the Exercise of the Miraculous Gift of *Healing*.

There are but 2 Passages wherein 'tis so much as mention'd. The one is, That in *St. Mark, VI. 13.* And they cast out many Devils, and Anointed with Oyl many Sick Persons and heal'd 'em. The other is, That in *St. James, V. 14, 15.* Is any Man sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he hath committed Sins, they shall be forgiven him. Now the Council of Trent may be as liberal of their *Anathema's* as they please. But they can never make any that impartially consider and compare these two Passages, believe that this Rite of *Anointing with Oyl* was us'd on any other Occasion but that of Exercising this miraculous Gift of *Healing*. Nor was it always us'd in the Exercise of that Gift it self. But that it was an Appendix of that Gift is manifest from both these Passages. Those that were Anointed in *St. Mark* are said thereupon to be healed. And those whom *St. James* requires the Elders of the Church to Anoint, he supposes those Elders to offer the Prayer of Faith for their Recovery, and assures 'em such Prayer of Faith shou'd be answered by the Sick Person being rais'd and

and restor'd by God. And that St. Mark and St. James speak of the same *Unction* is own'd by the Council of Trent, who tell us, *This Sacrament was insinuated by St. Mark, Commended and Published by St. James.* And hence it plainly follows, That if St. Mark mentions no *Anointing* but in order to *Healing the Sick*, St. James can be understood of no other. And accordingly Cardinal Cajetan freely owns on that passage of St. Mark, "That the Apostles us'd *Anointing* for healing only, not for any Sacramental use. And on that of St. James, he ingenuously declares, "That St. James's words speak nothing of *Sacramental Unction*, but rather of that which was us'd in *healing the Sick*. The Text (as he observes) do's not say, *is any Man mortally Sick?* But *is any Man sick?* And it affirms the *Recovery* of the Sick Person to be the Effect of the *Anointing*, and speaks only *conditionally* of his *Forgiveness*, &c.

2. Nothing therefore can be more groundless than for those to use this *Rite* who have no such miraculous *Gift of Healing*.

The *Anointing with Oyl* in St. James was to be accompany'd with the *Prayer of Faith* for the *Recovery* of the Sick Person, even such *Prayer of Faith* as had a Promise of God's Audience and Acceptance in the *raising the Sick Person*, And it was only to be us'd in that Case. But the *Romish Priests* do not pretend to offer up any such *Prayer of Faith* for the *Raising of Sick Persons*, nor do they so much as pretend, that their *Recovery* is the ordinary *Effect* either of their *Prayers*, or of their *Faith* in offering 'em.

And this leads me to add,

3. That 'tis yet more senseless and absurd to use this *Rite*, where they are so far from *Expecting* the Sick Person's *Recovery* that they rather look upon his Case as *desperate* and *hopeless* in that respect.

St. James's *Anointing*, was us'd with an Eye to and Expectation of the Sick Person's *Recovery*, and when they cou'd by the instinct and direction of the Spirit of God, pray in the particular *belief* of it. But the *Popish Extreme Unction* is not to be administred, but where the Sick Person is thought to be in a *dying condition*, and past any ordinary hope of *Recovery*. 'Tis therefore call'd *Extreme Unction*, and asserted by the Council of Trent to be the *Sacrament of the Dying*. And 'tis accompany'd with no *Prayer of Faith*

Faith for the Sick Person's Recovery, and no believing *Persuasion* concerning it. From whence it undeniably follows, That their *Unction* and that in *St. James* cannot be the same, since *theirs* is never us'd for the main, nay, the only intent and purpose for which his is enjoin'd. Nay, their *Unction* is then only to be Administred, when 'tis suppos'd that the great End of that recommended by *St. James* is not to be expected.

From hence it also follows, That this *Rite* of Anointing being only us'd in the Gift of Healing, was but temporary, and the use of it to expire, when the exercise of that Gift ceas'd. And accordingly we have no such intimation concerning the perpetual use of it, as concerning the use of Baptism, which is to be Celebrated to the end of the World *; or of the Lord's Supper, which is to be Administred till Christ's second coming *.

* XXVIII.
Matt. 19, 20.
* 1 Cor. XI.
26.

And for the Practice of the Ancient Church, the Learned *Dailé* has so fully prov'd the Popish *Extreme Unction* to have been unknown till about the 12th Century, that I shall refer the Reader to his Treatise of *Extreme Unction*, that desires to be inform'd concerning the Rise of it.

And for all these Superstitious Ceremonies us'd in preparing the Matter of this Sacrament, and in the Administration of it, as there is no pretence of Divine Institution for 'em, so they look so like Magical Tricks and Charms, that Men cannot offer a viler Indignity to the Christian Religion, then to debase it by such Scandalous Fopperies as these. 'Tis the Glory of the Christian Religion, That the Sacred Rites which the Gospel enjoins, are plain and simple, as well as few, and carry the manifest stamp of Divine Authority on 'em. And to load it with a vast number of useless and Phantastical and Heathenish Rites, is like darning an exquisite Natural Beauty with Paint; Christianity shines with the truest Lustre when it appears in its own Native Simplicity. This Meretricious Pomp and Pageantry do's as much blemish and sully its true Glory, as Painting the Windows obscures the Light.

F I N I S.

